SHORT STRICTURES OR ANIMADVERSIONS On so much of Mr Croftons [*Fastning St Peters Bonds*] As concern the *REASONS* OF THE *UNIVERSITY of OXFORD* Concerning the Covenant.

By *Tho. Tomkins* Mr. of Arts, and Fellow of *All-Souls* Coll. in *Oxon.*

LONDON:
Printed by *E. C.* for *A Seile* over against St. *Dunstans* Church in *Fleetstreet.* 1661.

1661
T658

To the Reverend

JOHN MEREDITH

Doctor of Divinity, and
Warden of *All-Souls*
Colledge in *Oxford.*

Honoured Sir,

BEfore I presume to beg your *Patronage*, I must bespeak your *Pardon*. You might indeed justly wonder, how I should think my self able to judge what were material in this weighty *Controversie*; did I not live in an age of so much *Light*, that there are *two things* we are all able to do: *viz.* to *Reform a Church*, and *Model a State*. There is *a Fault* (I must confess) in *Our*

(as in *All*) *Governments*, which as ſome men are reſolved never to Pardon, ſo I have no hope ever to ſee mended, *viz.* That *all are not uppermoſt.*

There is *an Objection* will be made againſt this Innocent Treatiſe, that it is wrote againſt *Conſciencious men.* I cannot deny but that the concerned Gentlemen are admirably furniſhed with *Conſciences* for every occaſion. To prevent this Cavil, my appeal is to You who know what *conſcience* is; having ſuffered ſo much to preſerve a good one: *A tryal,* thoſe Gentlemen were never very forward to undergo, nor (if my Augury fail me not) ever mean to be. That *ſacred thing* (or what was miſtaken

miſtaken for it, or at leaſt called by that Name) hath done ſtrange things in this Nation, which it highly concerns ſome to enquire whether it will juſtifie. We read in Scripture of *Obeying for conſcience*; but not one word of *Rebelling for it*. And yet men can do it, and at the ſame time make *the written Word* the rule of their Action. It firſt diſtinguiſhed between *the Kings Perſon* and His *Power*, and next between his *head* & his *ſhoulders*. And truly, they who once *divide the Kings Perſon* and *Power* are concerned that they never *unite* again.

Becauſe men do dayly *diſobey Laws* upon the ſcore of *conſcience*, and for that reaſon take them-

ſelves, and are taken by others, for *Innocent*; I ſhall beg your leave to ask this Queſtion, Whether *following Conſcience* is a ſufficient Plea to quit us from *ſin*, even where it is ſo indeed? (To ſay nothing of thoſe Univerſal Pretenders, *Artifice* and *Melancholy*.) The Scripture maketh mention of *ſeared Conſciences*, *reprobate minds*, which ſure are no great perfections; and of *ſtrong deluſions*, which though they be *new lights* are but *flaſhes of hell-fire*. And St. *Paul* reckons himſelf *the greateſt of ſinners*, for what he did out of the dictates of *conſcience* [*I my ſelf thought verily that I ought to do many*, &c.] Theſe are competent grounds of rendring that *Tenent* ſuſpicious.

I ask

I ask therefore briefly, Hath *the conſcience* any *rule* beſides it ſelf, or no? If not; How is *the written Word* of God *the rule* of Action? If it have; Whether it be poſſible for it to ſwerve from its Rule, or no? If not; then every man is *infallible*, there can be no ſuch thing as *ſtrong deluſions*, *believing a lie*, &c. If it be poſſible for *conſcience* to ſwarve from its *Rule*; whether its *ſwarving* be its *Innocency*? For if it be not ſo, it is no ſufficient ground for men to conclude themſelves *innocent*, when they *diſobey Authority*, becauſe it is *their conſcience* ſo to do, becauſe *the Word of God* (to which *Conſcience* as well as other *Faculties* ought to be ſubject, and ſins when it is not)

preſcribes *obedience to Governours* in the moſt univerſal terms imaginable. I could not but ſay thus much; becauſe, [*This is our conſcience*] was the old *non-conformiſts* firſt plea, and the latter (in name only different) *Enthuſiaſts* only plea; and if it be a ſufficient one, it muſt hold *in all caſes* as well as *any*: becauſe the reaſon is equal in all. It may juſtifie thoſe many who killed *the King*, and thoſe many more who killed *our Saviour*.

My want of years and judgement I ſhall not at all *excuſe*, but *urge* as my fitneſs for this employment; It were a diſparagement to *the Univerſity of Oxford*, if ſuch an Antagoniſt could not be anſwered by one of the meaneſt

neſt who can plead relation to ſo Renowned a Body.

The many weakneſſes you will find in *theſe papers* are ſo many evidences that I came to *Oxford* in *times of Reformation*, when *Learning* was counted little leſſe then an enemy to *Grace*, as indeed it was to what they called ſo.

Our Imperfections (*Honored Sir*) we bluſh not to diſcover to you whoſe goodneſs will not *ſee* them but only to *remove* them: whoſe buſineſs is, not ſo much to *preſide*, in a Colledge, as to *reform* it; to be our *Warden*, as *Example*. Like *the Sun* who when he *rules* the world, *enlightens* it too, when he *ſhines* he *cheriſhes*; ſo that its moſt ſpendid *Majeſty*

is

is but *Love* in all its glory: So your Commands are ſo many *boons*, and injunctions *endearments*: ſo that you do not *rule* but *aſſiſt* and *oblige* us; and have now abundantly ſatisfyed the Obligation *the Founder* laid upon you of *promoting the good of the Colledge* to your uttermoſt, by vouchſafing to take us into your particular care. So that how mean ſoever *this Preſent* is, from your ſelf I am aſſured to learn how, in time to come, I may make *a better*: And in the mean time glory that I can account my ſelf,

Honored Sir,

All Souls Coll. *Oxon Sept.* 26.

Your moſt devoted and obliged Servant,

THO. TOMKINS.

To the Reader.

READER,

I *Very well foreſee, that many (who are conſcious to themſelves, that ſuch things are poſsible) will* laugh *and* ſcorn *at the* Author *of this* Treatiſe, *as one who meant to write* the ſenſe *of* the Times, *rather then* his own. *In the beginning therefore, I* bar all *who have been themſelves* guilty *of what they only ſuppoſe to be,* viz. *Our* late Complyers, *whoſe* conſciences *have been in this ſenſe* tender, *that they might be* bended *any way. And now, I hope, I have prevented*

my

my moſt numerous and ſevere Accuſers. *But, now I think on it, I will releale them too; let them employ all their* art *and* paſſion, *in telling the World,* how uuworthy ſuch Proceedings (*while they have been their own*) are. *For why ſhould I* hinder *ſuch men from* laughing *at themſelves? The worſt all thoſe can ſay of me is,* I am like them; *and that were* bad enough, *if it were* true.

This Account is civil enough *for theſe men: I ſhould gladly afford them another, if I had any reaſon to think ſo well of them, that their* Principles *would not* fail *them: if it ſhould once happen, that they would* conſiſt *with their* duty; *and that their* beloved Rule,

Rule, Obey *the* preſent Power, *whatever it be* (*Blaſphemouſly called* following Providence) *had not* this one, *and that* the only, Exception, *Provided it be not* the Lawful Power. *And ſure there is too much Reaſon ſo to* gueſs, *when thoſe whoſe Conſciences* ſcrupled nothing *under an* Uſurper; *ſcruple* indifferent things *under* their King: *when* Perjury, *nay* Covenant-Breaking, Sacriledge, *and* Treaſon, *were eaſier in thoſe dayes* ſwallowed; *then a* Ceremony *in theſe.*

My own faults, *in* the Performance, *are ſo* many, *that I would not willingly be obliged to* anſwer *for* any more *then* mine own; *viz.* The Ill-timing, *&c. But*

how

how to assure those men (I before spoke of) of the truth of any thing I shall assert, about my own intentions in that, or any thing else; I professe I am utterly Ignorant: since they, out of their own experience of themselves, very well know, that the most Solemn Oaths and Imprecations, are not sufficient Evidences of ones sincere meaning.

But there are others, who are capable of, and therefore deserve, a better account; who as they abhorred Time-serving in themselves, are loath to suspect it in another: it being very hard for him who doth no ill himself, to think, without great cause, Ill of another. To them I say thus:

Whoever

Whoever thinks this time unſeaſonable *for a* Treatiſe *of this* Nature, *my opinion is ſo perfectly the ſame with his, that, had it been in mine own choyce, I ſhould not have needed to have told the World ſo. And this I* inſiſted *upon in ſeveral Letters to* one *of that* place *and* prudence (*whoſe commands it was ſcarce manners for me to diſpute*) *more preſſingly then many others (perhaps the moſt cenſorious) would.*

I urged that the Conteſt was about the Covenant, *which had been already* anſwered *by the Parliament*; *The only way it* deſerved *to be* conſidered. *And to compoſe ſuch* a Treatiſe, *would be but to produce* evidence *againſt* one

one who was executed the week before. But this Objection doth not, I confess, reach the case so fully as I apprehended it would, before I had exactly read over Mr. Cr. Book; because Mr. Cr. sometimes in pursuit of his Argument, oftner in running away from it, doth insert Principles no way relating to the Covenant, then as they may be subservient to the main (though disowned) end of the Composers of it, viz. Anarchy in Church and State, as several notions about the Kings Prerogative, Liberty, Propriety, the Original of Government, Sacriledge, Will-worship, the Power of the Church, Holy-dayes, Superstition, Scandal, &c. Which

accor-

according to his explication (*who to say the truth, speaks out all*) *the* Covenanters *were more wary, then professedly to own. Now I suppose, there is no Reason why* Errours, *because they are, in a Book, wrote in* defence *of* the Covenant *should be* priviledged *from* Confutation: *this were to invest* the Covenant *in* the Grave, *with the same Power it exercised in* the Throne.

There are two Reasons (*Reader*) *which I have prevented thee from* using; *which, had they seemed* sufficient *to One who is better able to* judge *then I, or possibly, thy self canst pretend to* be, *thou hadst missed of that* sport, *thou thinkest thy self to make with them.*

Which yet I cannot deny, but that there is ſome ground of ſuſpicion *for; when I conſider* the practices *of ſome in, and the* opinions *(thence drawn) others* have of, *the* Place *I live in: For it may be thought firſt, That I write now* againſt the Covenant, *upon the ſame ſcore in* theſe times, *upon which I would have wrote* for it *in* others: Tenents *as well as* Cloths, *changing with* the Faſhion. *As to this, I only ſay this: Of thoſe few that do know me, many can witneſs me to be* innocent *in this* particular, *even when they dare not ſay* themſelves have been ſo.

But if not this, *it may (perhaps) be thought, that this is*

a

a ſage Contrivance *of a* ſneaking Schollar, *who being reſolved to* write *againſt* ſome body, *choſe one who* durſt not anſwer. *I muſt confeſs this would have troubled me, had this been my* firſt attempt: *It is well known, I appeared as to the* civil part (*and to* the Covenant, *as it referred to* that) *when the Preſſe was open enough, ſince which, all Mr.* Cr. *Books on* that ſubject, *have been writ.*

There was one thing more which diſwaded *me* from, *and* hindered *me* in, *the* finiſhing *this; and that alone would have me have* ſuppreſſed, *now it is done; which I to that end propoſed to that* Reverend Perſon *who engaged me*

in it, viz. *A fear that it might* displeaſe *the* judicious Royaliſts, *as being an occaſion to multiply the number of* (*what is already too great*) Seditious Pamphlets, *it being not probable, that of thoſe* numerous Abettors *of Mr.* Cr. *and his* cauſe *he brags of, not* one *ſhould offer to aſſert* either. *But I do aſſure all thoſe worthy perſons, I received* a Negative *as to* this *too, from one, in* whoſe judgment *they would readily* acquieſce; *and deſired me to go on, for that* the Times *did require* (*what ſure this* Book *did not*) an Anſwer *to Mr.* Cr. *This Book, I muſt confeſs, comes out* late *againſt* the Covenant; *I wiſh ſome men had* more honeſty, *or* leſſe countenance,

tenance, *that this may be* the laſt; *or if not ſo, That there may never be need of other* weapons, *beſides* Pens *againſt it. If thou wilt yet be* ſatisfied (*Reader*) *that I was* only paſſive *in* the Publiſhing, *I am* glad; *if not, I am reſolved not* to be ſorry.

The Introduction.

EIther *the Covenant* is in its ſenſe *as Loyal*, and in its obligation *as indiſpenſable* as it is at preſent thought *convenient* to be aſſerted; or, it is *not*. If not; why is there ſuch a do made about that, which if in any circumſtances of *affairs*, certainly in *theſe*, obligeth not? But if it is; How came it to paſs, that it was *totally forgot* by *themſelves*, when *the Rump*, or *the Cromwels* appeared to be in *good earneſt* againſt it. Sure I am, the very *Covenanters* thrived by *contrary Oaths* and *practiſes*. Sure I am, that *whole party*, (very, very few particulars excepted) have been ſuch *baſe complyers with*, nay *flatterers of*, every thing, but their *lawful Prince*; take

as *unworthy conditions* from an *unlawful Power*, as themſelves would fain have *impoſed* upon *the one only lawful one*. That they have *diſcovered* hitherto no other *uſe* of their *conſcience*, but in *ſcrupling* at *things indifferent*, and that too, when it brought along with it *gain* and *credit*. Be turned out of a *Benefice* of 30 *l.* a year, when to be *a ſilenced Miniſter* was worth a 100. The inſtances of other *ſufferers* are not very numerous; nor when *tryal* comes to be made, will, I ſuppoſe, be. Where was their *Allegiance* to King *Charles* in Queen *Richards* dayes? Him they courted upon theſe two accounts, He was *an Uſurper*, and ſo obliged to *ſecure* them in other *mens eſtates*, *Qualis Rex, talis Grex*. And ſecondly, he was *an eaſie fool*, and ſo apt to be *ruled* by *crafty Knaves*. Nor did they trouble Him with *their Covenant*; becauſe they were *ſure* to *enjoy* what they *intended by it*, viz.

other

other mens Eſtates: No matter for *the Scotch Government*, when without it they can *ſecurely* keep *Engliſh Livings*. Nor was it of any great Concern to have this Church *reformed* according to their *principles*, when *the beſt endowed Churches* were *reformed* into their poſſeſſion. He who endeavours to perſwade me to an *Oath*, himſelf in caſes of *danger* or *profit* broke, takes me a *Fool*, and engages me to take him for a *Knave*.

If the *Covenant* be a *National Obligation*, obliging *all*, even thoſe who took it not, as well as thoſe who took it, and *Poſterity* into the bargain, (as Mr. *Cr.* in the ſixth Section throughout) none are more *guilty* than thoſe who *impoſed* and *aſſerted* it, becauſe none have acted more contrary to it, according to that *loyal ſenſe* which is now put on it. The truth is, it is penned ſo *ambiguouſly*, that (like their *Conſciences*)

ſciences) it might ſuit *all times*. They ſwear in the third Article [*To preſerve the Kings Perſon and Authority, &c.*] By preſerving the *Kings perſon*, their *practice* teaches me to underſtand *preſerve*, i. e. *keep ſafe*. i. e. *in cuſtody*, i. e. *in Priſon*: As for his *Authority*, that was *preſerved* too; where, as things then ſtood, they could have been content it ſhould have been *continued*: That they would have preſerved *the Kings Authority*, I ſhall not deny but in *whoſe hands* let themſelves ſpeak. They told us pretty fair at the beginning of the *War*, See 19 *Propoſitions*: All the Kings *Privy Council* to be approved by them, take ſuch an *Oath* as they pleaſed; ſo likewiſe *the Chancellour, Judges, the Steward*, &c. all the great *publique Officers*; ſo likewiſe *Peers*, the whole *Militia* at their diſpoſal, and the marriage of *the Kings Children*, all who had ſtood for *the King*, to be at the mercy

mercy of *the Parliament*. Their other Propoſals were much at the rate of theſe, I therefore paſs them over all, and ſo I ſhall their *Votes* of *Non-Addreſſe*, with their *Declaration* upon them, becauſe *ſhame* hath made them buy them all up, ſo that upon ordinary enquiry they are not to be had, and themſelves revoked them when they knew not well how to help it, but were fain to make a vertue of *Fear* and *Spite*, and call it *Loyalty*, at the *Iſle* of *Wight-Treaty*, where the *Kings Party* muſt be firſt acknowledged *guilty* of the *blood ſhed* in the War, in the *Preface*, and accordingly treated in the *Articles*; *the Militia*, *Law-making*, *Officers*, *&c.* all in them ſolely for twenty years, all *Peers* made by the *King* ſince *the Great Seal* went to him, null; their *Great Seal* approved, *&c.* with much more to be ſeen in the *Articles*: And after all this, for fear ſome *Regalia*, ſome

ſhadow

ſhadow of *Authority* ſhould have eſcaped their *obſervation*, they only Voted *his Conceßions a fit ground for eſtabliſhing a peace*, ſo that if they could think of any thing elſe which looked like *Authority*, they were reſolved to have it, for the *Agreement* was only *begun*, not *made*.

As to *the Kings Perſon*, I do not finde they can acquit themſelves much better; I very well know, that in *the actual cutting off the Kings Head*, and ſome other *attendant violences*, the Army did not ſuffer the *Presbyterian party* to have the whole ſhare of *the benefit*: but I ſuppoſe that will not free them from the whole ſhare of the *guilt*; except, when two joyn in an *unlawfull deſign*, he who is *outwitted*, is preſently *innocent*.

Firſt, I enquire, whoſe *Army* it was? who *raiſed* them, furniſht them with *opportunity* (not at preſent to ſay, *Principles*?). Had there been

been no more, they could not have been eaſily acquitted; for a man is reſponſible for the *conſequents* of his *unwarrantable actions*, eſpecially if they are foretold, and he will not deſiſt: In that caſe he can ſcarce ſay, He did not intend thoſe *conſequences*, not at all pretend he did not *produce* them.

In our Law, if a man in his *lawfull calling*, doth an act, though without his *intent* or *knowledge*, by which a man is unawares to him *killed*, the *puniſhment* is *ſevere*, though *morally* he cannot be ſuppoſed to help it: As *a Maſon* throwing *ſtones* or *timber* from the top of a Houſe, a *Man* going by, by chance is *killed*; but if ſuch a Man doth ſuch an act out of his *Calling*, it is *Death*, and that *deſervedly*: So the *two Houſes*, had they profeſſed *no hoſtility* to *the King*, they not being in *their employment*, the power of *the Sword* not at all being by our

Lawes

Lawes veſted in them, nor can they make out which way they came by, or who gave them, that *Authority*; whatever is the *conſequent* of their ſo doing, they are guilty of it, be it what it will: And truly it is reaſonable, that they who will *uſurp employment*, ſhould be *obliged* to ſee *the Ills* of it not to be greater than thoſe which before perhaps they did but *fancy*.

He who forces me out of the *ſecurity* of the *Law*, and by *violence* confines me to *another protection*, is obliged to ſee that that be not *leſs*. And this would have been ſo, ſuppoſe *the King* to have had *the rights* barely of *a private perſon*: He who without *authority* of *Law*, but ſolely upon the grounds (*real* or *imaginary*) of *expediency*, will *commiſſion*, *enrage*, and *arm* men againſt me, and after their having made them my *mortal Enemies*, make them my *Life-guard*, commit my

my *life* to the keeping of thoſe, themſelves had often repreſented me to, as not *fit* to *live*; he before *God* and *Man* is anſwerable for my *life*, without whom thoſe others could have had neither *power*, nor *pretence*, nor, in all probability, would have *a will* to take my *life* from me.

But (alas) how ſmall a part of the *Presbyterian Parliaments* guilt is this, from whom they received not only *opportunity*, but *principles* and *example?* They not only *enabled*, but *taught* the Army by *doctrine* and *practice*. Impriſoning *the King*, our *Law*, and *common ſenſe* too, calls *compaſſing his Death*: For in that caſe, *his life*, as to the *publique*, can be nothing but a capacity of *taking away* theirs, and they all that while are in a fair probability of being *hanged*. After the *impriſonment* of *a King*, ſuppoſe him like to *eſcape*, and head *a numerous party*, did he not

not deſerve to be farther *proceeded* againſt? and would not their *own ſecurity* require it? Would they have ever reſtored *the King* to the Exerciſe of *any power*, till he had aſſented to what they ſhould pleaſe or no? If no, I deſire to know firſt what *the Army* did more then that? Secondly, what *a King* he were, who had nothing to do in *the Government*, but only *grow* under it? And thirdly, why may not they who have *Authority* to depoſe *a King*, and have *juſt grounds*, *viz.* the *ſecurity* of the *publique*, may not for the *aſſurance* of that *ſecurity*, put him to *death*. If they would have reſtored *the King*, though he had not *tamely* ſaid *Yes* to every Demand, yielded his *Crown* to ſave his *Head*, let them ſay ſo for ſhame, if they can.

What they did, and owned from the beginning, and it may be too juſtly concluded from the *no remorſe* we finde in them, would *own again*, were

were it not for *fear* and *ſhame*, will juſtifie *the Army* from any thing but being their *ſervants*, who *underſtood*, and only *acted* their *Commandement*. In the firſt Reaſon for *a War*, [*The King was but a Truſtee, and had broken his truſt, which tended to the Diſſolution of Government.*] That was fair to begin with, [*Tended to*, &c.] *i. e.* The relation of *King* and *Subjects* was fairly going, and why, if but *a Truſtee*, and the *Truſt broken*, it may not be *re-ſeized*; I could almoſt tell them, I ſee no *cauſe*: Sure it would ſufficiently ſhew their *intentions*: in caſe of *the King*, but not at all better their own *claim*: I would not have *the Houſe of Commons* triumph too ſoon; becauſe, as is very evident, they had *received* their *whole power* and *truſt*; ſo *both*, in the Judgement of him who *called* them, and thoſe who *ſent* them, they had baſely *betrayed* it.

Again, *the King* was not *King* in his *perſonal*, but *political capacity*,

i.e. themſelves, againſt whom therefore to *wage War* was *Treaſon*, according to this, the cutting off *the Kings Head* cannot be *Treaſon*. I ſhall not deal farther in this, but only deſire all thoſe of them who would perſwade themſelves of their own *innocency*, that they are at leaſt thus far concerned, that they employed and empowered thoſe men, who but for them, never would have been able to *accompliſh*, nor in all likelihood to *contrive* that *black Act*; and that after *the King* had often by *rational* and *convincing Arguments* ſhewed it to be the *neceſſary reſult* of their *principles* and *proceedings*: And truely *the Army* were almoſt obliged, in their own defence to pull down *the King* and *Lawes*, they had ſo much offended, that they could ſcarce *hope* for *pardon*, nor at all be ſecured of it, *the King* being once reſtored, any farther then they were aſſured of *the Kings* regard to *Honour*

nour and *Conſcience*, a thing the *two Houſes* had very unworthily often declared to be *none at all*.

I cannot but obſerve how *the Parliament* thought to order the *King*, by employing ſuch men as would doe their work *throughly*. They could not in diſcretion truſt *the King*, but could *an Army*, and ſo betrayed themſelves with a great deal of *warineſſe*, as it is very ordinary for men to ruine their own *Intereſt* by preferring it before their *Duty*: And in that caſe the queſtion is this, Who knowes what is fitteſt to be done, *God* who *commanded this*, or *themſelves* who *contrived that*: And ſure it cannot be otherwiſe expected, but that God ſhould *declare* thoſe who take upon them to be *wiſer* then him, to be *very Fools*. But in our caſe, they did not more ſacrifice their *Religion* and *Allegiance* to *Craft* and *Intereſt*, then they did ſacrifice that *Craft*

and *Intereſt* to *Paſſion* and *Humour*; and truely it frequently happens, that they who change *Government*, do neither *mend* it as to the *Peoples* advantage, nor *enjoy* it as to their own. The chief Inſtruments of *proſperous Rebellion*, are uſually the *Avengers* of it, at once *expound* and *chaſtiſe* the *vice*, ſet up a *power* which is indeed *Arbitrary* both in the *rules* and *exerciſe* of it, when that they had pulled down one, which was only *called* ſo, it fared ſo with us. The people had as little need to be fond of their *Patriots*, as they of their *Army*: Neither of us have cauſe to complain of any but our ſelves: It was juſt with God to permit us our *ruine*, when we were *fond* of it, that after we had complained without *a cauſe*, we ſhould have *cauſe* to complain.

The *Parliament* and *People* both ſay they were *unhappy*, let us ſee whether

whether they were not as *unwiſe*, beſide the being *diſhoneſt*.

We employed *Mercenary Souldiers*, to *ſecure* our *Liberties*, we expected that a *victorious Army*, i.e. *Legions* of *Indigent perſons* armed with *power* and *want*, ſhould ſecure *propriety*; after having *pulled down* their *Prince* ſubmit to their *fellow-ſubjects*; having ventured *Lives* and *Fortunes*, and their *Souls* too, to get *a Conqueſt*; having got it, intend only to be called *Good Boyes*, and then very *mannerly* retire to their *old Trades* and *Beggery*: This was not very *probable*, that after having *beaten* their *Enemies*, their *Friends* ſhould *Vote* them down.

Let the *Parliament* (as they did) tell them of *duty*, themſelves had employed againſt it, they will obey their *command* by your own *Example*, act according to the *declared ſenſe* of *the Houſes* interpreted by their *practice*: And in earneſt

neſt (were it not that *Sin* and *Vengeance* are not *laughing matters*) it would make one ſmile to hear a *Rebel* earneſtly tell others of their *Duty* to him, *conſcientiouſly* ſtate the *obligation* of an *Oath* to thoſe himſelf had employed in *breaking* all.

Sir *John Hotham* told his Majeſty, he would obey his *Commands* ſignified by both *Houſes of Parliament*, when *the Army* afterwards thought they had been *Rebels* long enough for other mens *ſakes* and *advantages*, it was time now to be ſo for *themſelves*: Had they then ſaid, they would obey *the Reſolves* of the *two Houſes* delivered by *his Majeſty*, could the moſt deſperate Villain in that Aſſembly have retorted any thing but *a Bluſh*. Is there any *diſparity* here but what is to the *diſadvantage* of *the two Houſes*, the *King* being their *Head*; nor can they oblige at all without *his conſent*, when as to *Militia* Affairs, *the*

King

King needs not their Authority at all.

We would willingly forget their *former Actions* if they would ſuffer us, but their deſire to begin again appears by reſuming (now all other marks of diſtinction are worn out) their ſo long laid aſide *Original Mark* and *Bond*, whereby to *diſcern* and *engage* their *Party*, to know *their ſtrength*, and how to *uſe* it: The *nature of* which being abundantly laid open by the *Oxf. Reaſons*; there needs no more to be ſaid as to the *ſtrength* of thoſe *Reaſons*, and *innocency* of the *Covenant*, then briefly to conſider ſome paſſages in both, which Mr. *Croſton* was willing to miſtake.

ERRATA.

Page 8. *line* 21. *read* whom *the Carthaginians* could not beat. *p.* 10. *l.* 17. *r.* could not do till then. *p.* 12. *l.* 19. *add*, Our Representes in *Parliament*, as to the exercise of *that Power* the Law vests in them, (which every one that knows *the constitution of England*, knows to have *bounds*) do legally bind us: because we chose them, and gave them authority for that purpose, *To consent for us*. But if they usurpe any *other Powers* (as the *Militia*, *Reforming the Church* in spite of the King, *&c.*) the conclude not us at all. We neither entrusted them, with any such Power, nor know of any such Power inherent in our selves to trust them with. This being very clear to any but those that will not see; in this sense I grant, That by, &c. *p.* 12. *l.* 21. *r.* do consent: and that. *p.* 13. *l.* 9. *r.* that if he. *l* 13. *add*, Good Doctrine for *the Rump*. *p.* 20. *l.* 4. *r.* and then to one which--- *p.* 24 *l.* 10 *r.* A Tenent, which the Army raised upon the score of this Covenant learnt so well. *p.* 32. *l.* 2. *f.* what, *r.* which. *l* 8. *f.* to, *r.* so. *p.* 42. *l.* 14 *after* questioned, *add*, it as to that. *p.* 43. *l.* 6. *aft.* nothing, *add*, of it. *p.* 45. *l.* 14. *dele* that. *p.* 46. *l.* 15. *f.* very be, *r.* be very. *p.* 84. *l* 3 Consider them though but as so many single persons, the Covenant bending. *p.* 85. *l.* 1. *r.* Which being a former bond, no mans Allegiance was. *p.* 145. *l.* 10. *r.* perswaded *the Nobles* that *Prelates*.

SHORT

Strictures or Animadversions on so much of Mr. *Crofions* [*Fastning S.* Peters *bonds*] as concerns The Reasons of the Universitty of *Oxf.* concerning the *Covenant.*

THE *Oxford* men say, They could not swear (as *not being able to say*) *That the Rage, Power, and Presumption of the Enemies of God was* (*in the sense there intended*) *encreased*, p. 1. Which was no more then this, They durst not mock God and the World by solemnly pretending to *call to minde* (as the phrase there is) what they did not believe to be at all. To which Mr. *Cr.* p. 26. *Their ability to say so, is of little moment*, &c. Is it a small Consideration in an Oath,

that I am not Able to say the thing I swear, to be true; nay, believe and think my self Able to prove false? *Others were able to say it.* Though this with the former, being wrote in another Character, may obtain our Notice, though not Assent; May I Swear upon another mans Knowledge? Must all the Church of *Romes* bad Tenents be reformed into worse practices? Doth our not *assenting*, by *implicite Faith* qualifie for Swearing upon *implicite belief?*

The *Oxf.* men say, That this way of Imposing an Oath, intrenches upon *the Kings Prerogative*; and surely Mr. *Cr.* Censures upon the Refusers of it, intrenches upon *Gods, The judicial Incapacity*, &c. he there suggests, is (because without *ground*) without *Charity*. The best of it is, it is easier to vote Malignants, then make Reprobates. *The Visitours*, who could by a vote *turn* men out of *Oxford*, could not do any more then barely

barely *wish* them out of *heaven*. I cannot but tell the resolved *Covenanters* (those I mean who *glory in*, and so are far from *shaking off*, this Bond of Iniquity) that there is something in themselves, which looks more like what is, or may end in *Judicial incapacity*, then any thing which can be pretended against the *Oxf.* men, *viz.* A resolution never to be perswaded otherwise. As the * *Sixth Article* enjoynes, *i.e.* They must never more *consider*, (or, if they do, it must be only to shew they dare *despise*) whatever *Reason* or *Religion* can say against those courses they are before-hand resolved of. Which thing, though it might make me *despair* to deal with them, doth it self *encourage* me. Sure I shall easily perswade men, that there is something very suspicious in that *Cause*, which will not endure any of its *Proselytes* should attend to what can be

* By whatever Combination, Perswasion, &c.

ſaid againſt it. Mr. *Cr.* hath yet another Anſwer to this, *If they did know it, though they were not able to ſay it, it was for us ſufficient.* Words which ſhall not be anſwered, till they are explained. *Words*, as well as *Men*, may ſcape by being in the dark: to be unintelligible is ſecurity againſt being confuted. I perceive it is good Policy to write ſome *non-ſenſe*, that we may be ſure that that at leaſt will remain *unanſwered.*

The two next Paragraphs are proofs of what the Univerſity profeſſes not to be convinced of; the encreaſe of the Rage, Power, Preſumption of the enemies of God, being encreaſed in the ſenſe intended, which were, *The troubles the three Kingdoms were at preſent in, the* Spaniſh Armado, *the Gun-powder Treaſon, the Colledge of* Propagators, Cuneus *his plot diſcovered to Sir* William Boſwel, *and by him to Archbiſhop* Laud, *laid open in* Romes *Maſterpiece.*

Firſt,

First, I obſerve by this and other Treatiſes referred to, (particularly, *The Soveraign Power of Parliaments*; wrote, as Mr. *Cr.* ſayes, ſolidly by Mr. *Prynn*, and ſome will not ſtick to ſay, as ſolidly by him ſince confuted) it is too apparent, That *Presbyterians*, thoſe I mean who plead for *the Covenant*, want nothing but *Opportunity* to play over their *old Game*. Contending ſo earneſtly for old *Premiſes*, can be nothing but an earneſt deſire to infer the ſame *Concluſion*. Me-thinks they ſhould not deſire the King to forget what themſelves will not. But all this is far from proving the Rage, Preſumption of the enemies of God to be encreaſed *in the intended ſenſe*, as appears thus:

The Covenant was made againſt that Party the King headed: who, for thoſe and ſuch like Reaſons, were the [*Open enemies*] Which name they deſerved either becauſe *they* propagated

Popery, or becauſe *others* did it. The latter will not (though practiſed) be *aſſerted*; nor the former *proved*. Firſt, I hope the old Plots, the *Spaniſh Armado*, the Gun-powder Treaſon, do not evince the King and his Party, to have been Popiſh: and for that later one of *Cuneus*, that it was diſcovered to the Archbiſhop, is no demonſtration at *Oxon.* that he drove it on. If the Archbiſhop was a Papiſt, I would willingly be reſolved, whether the Jeſuite *Fiſher* was a Proteſtant.

The Scotch Service Book, is an argument much uſed by thoſe, who never ſaw, or leaſt conſidered it. Retaining Formes and Ceremonies uſed in the Church of *Rome*, which were Ancient, Uſeful, and Innocent, is of great uſe: as to demonſtrate our conformity with the Primitive Church; and to convince *Rome*, we would not leave her, but where ſhe left her ſelf. Which is to prove our

Refor-

Reformation to be the result of Reason and Conscience, not Spite and Humour. Nor is this an evidence of, but a bar from, our return to *Rome*; For they who will not separate but upon, and no farther then there are, weighty Causes; are not like to return till those weighty Causes are removed: whereas they who separate in an Humour, may in a Humour unite again. Nay, they who are but partly guilty; who will abstain from actions otherwise innocent, because some they think ill of use them, acknowledge themselves guilty of separating more then there is cause for; that is, as I understand it, out of *Spite*, be the name it bears never so solemn. A deportment, *Christians* (of all men in the world; much more *Christian Churches*, should not use one toward another.

To Object our readiness to return to *Rome* upon so incompetent a ground, at the best was *Weakness*:

but to Object it *now*, when all those, the ruine of whom this Book endevours, have been resolute examples of our averseness from *Rome*, notwithstanding the sore temptations which (by means of this *Covenant*) they have been exercised with, can be nothing but *Malice*. Unless we will suppose, that those, who would not part with a good cause, when God seems to forsake it; should throw it away, now he appears to own it.

They tendred a Cardinals cap to the Archbishop. It is no new trick, to be rid of a most dangerous adversary, to make him suspected, and so not used, by his own party. *Hannibal* quickly understood *Fabius*, and as quickly foresaw his own speedy ruin, unless the *Romans* discarded that *General*. The *Carthaginians* could not *beat* him: therefore he was so maliciously kind to him, as not to injure him. The silly vulgar suspected, and the crafty knaves proclaimed him, to be a Confederate

federate of *Hannibals*: Nor was that errour diſcovered till there was reaſon to repent it. *Timeo Danaos vel dona ferentes.* Had there been leſſe ability and reſolution to oppoſe *Rome* in that *head*, it might in all probability have ſtood longer upon its own *ſhoulders*.

Mr. *Cr.* wonders at that expreſſion [*In the intended ſenſe*] without which words the *Oxf.* men would never have denyed the Rage, *&c.* of the enemies of God, and Religion to be at that time encreaſed: becauſe they ſaw and felt it. And truly on which ſide they were, Mr. *Cr.* ſhall witneſs, even where he is profeſſedly handling the Argument, p. 28. *Who abetted the murther of the late King.* Which Army did that, needs no diſpute. Who *commiſſioned* the men that did that; furniſhed them with Principles and opportunity; in proſecution of whoſe avowed Declarations and Reſolves, that Act might be juſtified:

juſtified: The men of *Oxf.* ſaw then as clearly, as all the World do eaſily now. If the Kings death was, as Mr. *Cr.* urges, a deſign of the Papiſts; the *King*, the *Biſhops*, and the *Royal Party* were not ſure their only Factors. You ſee, Sir, one may believe the preſumption of *the enemies of God*, to have been at that time increaſed; and yet, not in that ſenſe. That *Papiſts* rejoyced at our Troubles is granted: and withal, that they have not at all diſcovered their *ſorrow* (their *joy* they have) that this Covenant pulled down that Church, which themſelves by ſtrength of Arguments and Armies, could not do.

Oxf. Second Reaſon is,

They could not truly ſay, *That they had uſed or given conſent to any Supplication or Remonſtrance to the purpoſe therein expreſſed.*

The force of this is plainly thus, They durſt not ſwear they had done what

what they knew they never did. To which Mr. *Cr.* p. 29. *Had not they Repreſentees in Parliament? did they give No to ſuch Supplications? or, if they did, were they not carryed by the major Vote? and is not the Negative ſwallowed thetein, that all perſons and bodies Corporate did thereunto conſent?*

This a ſtrange piece of ſenſe. Whatever the Parliament upon other mens Supplications Vote, though of ſuch a nature as many men from their very ſouls abhor the thought of; it is for that ſole reaſon true, that they ſupplicated for it: and they may ſwear it, though they know they did not. On the other ſide, I conceive I may be bound to *ſubmit* to many Laws, as proceeding from a competent Authority, which I may truly affirm I neither did, nor was at all bound to *deſire*. Had the Parliament, when they firſt voted *No-Addreſſe*, in 1647. Voted the Kings death,

(which

(which they might have done by the ſame law of Reaſon, nor could their ableſt defenders ever anſwer *Goodwin* and others upon that Head) did every man in *England* therefore ſupplicate for it? But for Him we need not be ſollicitous, ſeeing at the very beginning of the War, he was declared but a Truſtee, who had ſhamefully betrayed his Truſt, *&c.* But if this Logick be good, there is a worſe ſtory behind, even this *Bleſſed Covenant* hath loſt its ableſt defendor, (not to ſay at one blow it hath loſt them all,) ſeeing *the Parliament* have voted the Covenant burnt: and Mr. *Cr.* himſelf may ſwear he hath ſupplicated for it. Sure he will finde a way to evade this ſpecial piece of Law ſo applyed. That by *the Parliament* all Perſons and Towns Corporate did conſent; that in things belonging to their cogniſance, the Majority concludes the whole Houſe, and they the Nation; I believe true and account it reaſonable. But

Mr.

Mr. *Cr.* good friend Mr. *Baxter* tells us another ſtory, and endeavours to prove it in the enlargement of his 179. Theſis, of the Efficient and Conveying cauſes of Power, *p.* 185, 186. *The Minor part*, if it be the better and wiſer, are not concluded; and if they have any advantage as ſtrength, *&c.* they may uſe it. I ſuppoſe that he thinks with *the Minor*, he will perſwade them, who will be not unapt to believe it of themſelves, that they are the wiſer and better.

The next thing conſiderable is, *p.* 30. an anſwer to the fourth Reaſon: which is, that they apprehended it not to be according to the Commendable practiſe of theſe Kingdoms, or the example of Gods people in other Nations; nay, the Defenders tels us, *The world never ſaw the like before.* To which M. *Cr.* tels us, *That Iſrael did in the dayes of Joaſh, Joſiah*, &c. The only difference is, in ſhort, one of the greateſt reaſons, for which this Covenant

venant was expresly and frequently refused and refuted: *Those* were with, *This* expresly against, him in whom that Obligatory Power lay, the Prince.

In his Reconciling these words with those of Mr. *Nye*, Mr. *Cr.* grants what is abundantly enough to prove what he denies [*That for Matter, Persons, and other Circumstances, the like had not been in Any age or Oath we read of in Sacred or Prophane Stories*]. Whence I thus argue, If there is so much in this Covenant distinct from what was ever in any before, and that so considerable, as to make a distinct Argument to commend this Covenant to the world, more then any other ever could pretend to; *That for Matter and Persons*, i. e. The *thing sworn*, and *persons swearing*, besides other circumstances, there had never been the like before. It is not imaginable this should be warranted by former examples, when neither

in

in *Matter* not *Perſons*, the *thing ſworn*, or *perſons ſwearing*, beſides other *attendant circumſtances, the like had ever been before.* It ſeems it was done after, and warranted by the example of a thing nothing like it.

According to Mr. *Cr.* method we proceed to

The Firſt ARTICLE.

Firſt exception is, *They are not ſatisfyed how they can in judgement Swear to preſerve the Religion of another Kingdom.*

To which Mr. *Cr. p.* 39. *Tis but Reaſon they ſuſpend their act till they can ſwear in judgement.*

If ſo, the Viſitors, the tender-conſcienced Viſitors, turned the *Oxf.* Heads out of their places (and by the way put themſelves in) for not doing what in Mr. *Cr.* judgement, they ought not to have done. But neither

neither hath he given or offered any thing to ſatisfie us, How and where Chriſt bound us to Swear the Reformation of another Kingdom by fire and ſword. Gods people, ſure we are, Jewiſh and Chriſtian, had Idolators in the Regions round about them: yet we do not finde them Covenanting to pull down the Idols of ſilver and gold, that they might put the ſilver and gold in their own Pockets. If the *Scots* may Covenant to reform *England* and *Ireland*, why not *France* and *Spain*? Doth Religion forbid them violence in its cauſe againſt all but their own Prince? or is Rebellion never ſanctified till it is againſt him, to whom we owe particular Allegiance?

But beſides the general unwarrantableneſs of ſuch courſes; the *Oxf.* men render ſeveral Reaſons peculiarly relating to Themſelves and that Cauſe. As firſt, *That as it did not concern them to have much, ſo they profeſſed*

profeſſed to have very little underſtanding of it. Which, though Mr. *Cr.* is pleaſed to *wonder at*; another man poſſibly may not at all think it *ſtrange*, that wiſe-men ſhould not trouble themſelves with what did not *concern* them. When he ſayes, *They ſhould know as much as all the Nation beſides*; I deſire to know *his opinion* of thoſe Gentlemen who came into *their places.*

The next thing of moment is, *p.* 42. in anſwer to the *Fourth Reaſon*; where, the *Oxf.* men find in *Scotland, ſeveral things tending toward Superſtition and Schiſm*; as accounting *Biſhops Antichriſtian*, and *Indifferent Ceremonies unlawfull.* Where, firſt, he catcheth at thoſe Phraſes, *tending toward*; and, *to our thinking*: where he triumphs thus, *Me-thinks, Superſtition and Schiſme ſhould be ſo well known at* Oxf. *that they might be able to conclude what things tend thereunto.* Modeſty of

Expreſſion, is no more a ſign of *Ignorance*; then Bold peremptorineſs, is an infallible evidence of *Knowledg*. When St. *Paul* ſayes, *I Think, I have the Spirit of God*; ſhould a witty Sophiſter retort, *What? the great Apoſtle of the* Gentiles, *who magnifies ſo his Office, but* Think, *he ſhould know whether he hath the Spirit, or no?* Nay, this grave Corrector, in this very place, uſeth the *ſame expreſſion* he carps at, *Me-thinks, Superſtion*, &c.

The Charge is this, They account *Biſhops Antichriſtian*, and *Indifferent Ceremonies unlawful*, and make *their Diſcipline a Mark of the true Church*, and *the ſetting up thereof the erecting the Throne of Jeſus Chriſt*. There is but one way to excuſe this from *Schiſm*, and that too many *Nonconformiſts* have taken, which is to ſay, They do not *divide from a Church*; becauſe, where theſe *fancies* are not *received*, there are *no Churches*;

Churches; not considering, they have by that means *un-Churched all the World*, that any History gives an account of. And that for so many *ages*, that if this be true, *the gates of hell prevailed against the Church*, as soon as themselves can *pretend* it made *the first attempt*. But this Mr. *Cr.* would willingly salve. *They give Assemblies Authority about Ceremonies*, ergo, *do not deem Indifferent Ceremonies unlawful*. If so, *Ceremonies* not *commanded* in the Word of God may be *enjoyned*.

They make Discipline rightly administred, as is prescribed in the Word of God, the Note of a true Church, but do not appropriate it unto theirs. Either *their Discipline* is *prescribed* in the *Word* of *God*, or *not*. If *not*; they did well to swear and fight down *Ours*, for not *being* in *the Word of God* prescribed, to make way for another, which it self is not *there*. If it be *there prescribed*, and yet this Title

[*Preſcribed in the Word of God, which is the Note of a true Church*] be not *appropriate* to it, but may *belong* to another; and that which either is not in *the Word of God*, which is *the former inconvenience*; or, which is in *the Word of God* as well as *theirs*: and then there be two ſeveral Diſciplines preſcribed in the Word of God. A Doctrine, I ſuppoſe, our *Scotch*-Maſters would not once have liked.

They deem indeed Engliſh-Popiſh-Ceremonies unlawful; but deny them to be Indifferent, p. 43.

Are they *unlawful* becauſe uſed in *Popiſh-Churches*, or for any other Reaſon? If for any other Reaſon; that ſhould have been *expreſſed*, or at leaſt *intimated*, ſo as we might have gueſſed at it. If for that reaſon alone, (as ſeems, being *alone alledged*, The appellation, *Popiſh:*) I do not apprehend, how another mans *uſing a thing*, can make it *unlawful* for me to

uſe

uſe it. For *ſin* is nothing elſe but *the tranſgreſſion of a Law.* What then, by the *laws of God*, and my *juſt Superiours* is not *prohibited me*; it is not imaginable, how a *Heathen*, *Turk*, *Jew*, or (which ſome make worſe) a *Papiſt*, can by *doing it* make *it unlawful* for me to *do.* For ſeeing the Laws of God and Man have *left it free*; he or I, either or both, in *doing ſuch a thing* do but uſe our *indulged Liberty*, that which is *left free* for us to do. Now, how it comes to paſs, That his *uſing* his *lawful liberty*, ſhould *deprive* me of mine, I would gladly know. The Queſtion ſeems to me this, How it can be *criminal* in me, to *imitate* other men (ſuppoſe *Papiſts*, whom, I hope, I may reckon *Men*) in thoſe caſes in which they are *confeſſedly Innocent*? for ſo, in this preſent Caſe, *Papiſts* confeſſedly are; ſeeing they *tranſgreſs* no *law* of *God* or *Man.* For had it been otherwiſe; not its *being uſed by Papiſts*,

but *the law*, againſt which *the action is*, ſhould have been *urged* as the Reaſon of the *ſin of it*.

The *Jews*, who *crucified* Chriſt in *his perſon*, and *perſecuted* Him in *his members*, were certainly as *great enemies* to Chriſt, as *Papiſts* can in modeſty be ſuppoſed to be. Yet, St. *Paul* (whoſe trade was not to *gain* by *Factions*) would do *actions* upon that very ſcore, to be *like them*; complyed with them *in Ceremonies* which he knew to be aboliſhed, *To the Jew he became a Jew* in that ſort. I know it is ſaid, He did it *to win over the Jews*, and it is not likely we ſhould *win over the Papiſts*. A Diſcourſe dictated not by *Reaſon*, but *Malice*, which makes it *blind*, and (the blow miſſing its Adverſary) throws it ſelf. St. *Paul* was far from being *ignorant* how *the ſpirit of obduration*, was in a very great meaſure gone out upon *that People*; he yet durſt not omit all *poſſible condeſcenſion*. Their being

ſtubborn,

ſtubborn, was no warrant to Him to be *moroſe*. To *endeavour* was his *duty*, and he did it. What *uſe* they would make of it, he left *to them*; what *effect* it ſhould have, *to God*.

His laſt *Salvo*, is *p.* 44. The diſtinction between *verè* and *vera Eccleſia*. The *Scots* do not *un-church* all others for want of their Diſcipline, *Becauſe a True Church is oppoſed to a Corrupt, as well as falſly conſtituted*.

I demand here, *Whether a Church may be a Church of Chriſt without the Scotch-Diſcipline, or no?* If *No*, the Diſtinction is *impertinent*; not to ſay, crafty: ſerving to hide their meaning, till there is opportunity of diſcovering it. If *it may*, then there was no need of *a Covenant* and *attending-violences* to force in *that*, without which we may be *a Church of Chriſt*; and ſo, without it, *The Lord might have dwelt among us*, as

the phraſe of the Covenant is. Or if, for all that Grant, it is yet *neceſſary* to bring that *Diſcipline in*, in ſuch a manner; then it is not enough to be *a Church of Chriſt*, unleſſe we be *a Church of Scotland too*: and *Wars* are neceſſary, not only till a Church is *a true one*; but till every one acknowledgeth it *the beſt imaginable*. Atenent, the Army raiſed upon the ſcore of *this Covenant*; and learnt it ſo well, that they quickly taught their *Scotch-maſters* the meaning and conſequents of it.

The ſecond ground of the *Oxf.* mens Refuſal, is, They are not ſatisfied, *How they can ſwear to reform the Doctrine, Diſcipline, &c. Becauſe it cannot be changed without manifeſt ſcandal to the Papiſt and Separatiſt.*

1. By yielding the Cauſe, our *godly Biſhops* have by writings and ſufferings *maintained*.

2. By

2. By justifying *the Papists*, in calling Ours, *A Parliamentary Religion.*

3. By acknowledgement, that something to which *conformity is required*, is not agreeable to *the Word of God*, and so justifying *Recusancy* and *Separation.*

4. A confession that *our punishing of Papists was unjust*, because it was for not joyning with Us in *a form of worship*, which our selves approve not of as well as they.

To all which, *Cr.* bravely retorts, much at the rate of City-Logick, *p.* 45. *Tis well, Scandal is at length become an Argument of some force, had it been regarded from the Non-conformists*, &c. Here is *a triumph* when there is not only *no victury*, but *no fight.* When the *true sense* of an Argument is not to be avoided or endured; some can entertain themselves and some Readers, with putting on it *a sense*, they can answer. *Scandal*

in

in the Reaſon and in the Reply are no otherwiſe akin, then that the *Engliſh* words anſwerable to them, may upon an occaſion be drawn to make *a quarter quibble*. Becauſe σκάνδαλον, is tranſlated [*Offence*] Therefore every one who is *offended* in a different ſenſe, *i. e. angry*, is forſooth *ſcandalized*. A Doctrine, which hath brought *greater Scandals*, then thoſe it pretended to *remove* were ever *fancied* to be. It hath been it ſelf *a* σκάνδαλον, *a ſtumbling-block* whereat many have fallen. I ſhall diſcover and remove it.

Offence, which in Scripture (as hath by many learned men, beyond all exception been proved; and will demonſtrate it ſelf to any, that will but conſult the places where that word is uſed) is, *any action of Ours by which a Brother may be led on to ſin*. And that; either by *miſunderſtanding an Action of Ours* (which was the caſe of *eating meat offered to Idols*, which might

might have been interpreted *as in honour to the Idol*; and ſo one who thought well of us, might be induced to do it indeed) or elſe, *ſomething directly criminal, which we by word or example encourage others to.* The other notion of the word *Offence*, which the *Non-conformiſt urged*, and Mr. *Cr. revives, That whatever another is pleaſed to be angry at, is a ſin for me to do*; is in it ſelf *abſurd*, and in its conſequence *intolerable.* For then *the rule of my actions* ſhould not be *the Law of God*, and *the commands of my Superiour*, not repugnant to them, both which the Scripture expreſly obligeth me to, if it doth to any thing at all, but every peeviſh fellowes humour and melancholy: and, contrary to our Saviours *rule*, If my Brother were *angry with me without a cauſe*, not *he*, but *I ſhould be in danger of the Judgement.*

Nor could our conſciences be any longer ſatisfied in *any action*, than they

they were assured there were no *mistaken* or *humorous* well-meaning men in the world. St. *Paul* tels us, *If meat make my Brother offend, I will eat no meat while I live.* If this mistaken sense of *Scandal*, in this and such like *cases* were *true*, and we obliged upon such penalties as are assigned in Scripture, to men *guilty of that sin*: Christianity were *a bondage* greater then that wch. Christ came to *remove*, and *free us* from. Should a *sect* of well-meaning *ignorants* arise, who thought all Flesh and Wine *abominable*, (and some such there have been) are we all bound upon *pain of hell* to *forbear*? Because they are *angry*; is it therefore *true* that we *sinned*, because they upon no ground *thought* so? Do *Erronious conceits* alter *the nature* of things? Do *false opinions* by being *stifly held* become *true?* A *Surplise* must not be used in Divine Service, nor worn, because *a godly brother* is *angry!* The same Reason will conclude for *a*

black

black Gown. For *Sectaries* were once (and poſſibly are eſteemed again) *Godly*, and *Brethren*. This *palpable miſtake*, I have the longer ſtood upon, not only becauſe it occaſioned *Triumph*; but, becauſe I could not eaſily *apprehend it*, other than *wilful*. Becauſe the Reaſons have expreſſed it ſo *plain*, as to prevent all poſſible *miſunderſtanding*. In theſe words they have ſhewed wherein *the Scandal* did conſiſt, *viz.* [*In juſtifying the Recuſancy of One, and Separation of the Other*] *i. e.* in helping them to *a reaſon* to encourage, and ſo continue *their ſin*; not in making them *angry*, but *pleaſing* them too well. Nor is it likely for him who is *offended* in *the vulgar ſenſe*, to be *offended* in *the Scripture-ſenſe*. He who is *angry with me* for doing a thing, is not like to do it becauſe I do it; to *imitate me* in that for which he doth *abominate me*.

But

But here I cannot but obſerve, that *Reaſon* in this Section ſhould be *acknowledged*, when, by being ſo, it *overthrowes* their whole *cauſe*. The *Reaſons* are indeed ſo *preſſing*, and the *words* ſo uncapable of *a ſiniſter interpretation*; that *the Covenant* it ſelf muſt undergo *one* to avoid their *reach*. Where, after the droling Preface of, *Theſe ſerious Caſuiſts, with reverence may I note it, underſtand the Words of the Covenant Sophiſtically*, p. 46. He then preſents us with this Notion, *Religion, as it denotes the Matter, &c. is different from the Circumſtances, Order, and Ceremonies annexed and appendant, and none but ignorant Idiots will deem the change of them the change of Religion*, p. 46.

This is the firſt *Salvo*. The *Oxf.* Arguments are not *concluding*, becauſe nothing of the *Religion*, but *Circumſtances, Order*, and *Ceremonies* were to be *changed*; which was not that,

that, our Martyrs ſuffered for. What *ignorant Idiots*, as Mr. *Cr.* cals them, are theſe *Oxford Schollars*, who muſt underſtand *words* in their *true, plain, literal meaning?* What a ſilly Univerſity this was? Give me Mr. *Cr.* there is a man indeed, can find out a *meaning* of *words*, they are in no wiſe capable of! By the *Reformation* in *Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline*, is meant, in *Circumſtances, Order*, and *Ceremonies*. If this be the meaning, the words were *very ill choſen* to expreſs it. But withal, Mr. *Cr.* hath not at all mended the matter, by enforming us plainly, That they will uſe ſuch *violent proceedings*, when only *Circumſtances, Order*, and *Ceremonies* are *the Debate*.

But the *vanity* of the *former Plea* being (poſſibly to himſelf) apparent; The next *ſalvo* is, *p.* 46, 47, 48, 49. *We muſt make a diſtinction between what is Eſtabliſhed, and what is Exerciſed in* Engl. *&c.*

Becauſe

Becauſe all the Declaiming is about the latter, What is called *the Religion exerciſed?* I ſhall not flouriſh; that is, uſe many words, not to expreſs what I would ſay, but to hide my having nothing to ſay; but ask directly, becauſe I would be anſwered to, where I ſuſpect jugling. They have Sworn *to reform the Doctrine, Worſhip*, &c. *in* England, *according to ſeveral* (not at preſent to ſay *inconſiſtent*) *Rules*; *the Word of God, the Church of* Scotland, *the beſt Reformed Church.* I ask then. Do they mean to alter *the eſtabliſhed Doctrine*; or No? If yes; the *diſtinction* is vain and crafty: A *ſleight* inſtead of an *anſwer.* If no; doth *reforming* according to thoſe *rules*, that is, (as I underſtand it) *bringing in the Doctrine of* Scotland, *&c.* ſignifie, Doing ſome new *act* to continue the *eſtabliſhed Doctrine* in *England*; or to let it alone as it is? If either of *theſe*, let that word have the ſame *meaning* in

in all *parallel places*, and this Controverſie is at an end: But, how we ſhall be brought to *the ſame Confeſſion of Faith, Directory*, &c. which is alſo ſworn, without *altering the eſtabliſht Doctrine, Worſhip, Government*, which are different, is not very clear.

As to *the Doctrines* themſelves here called, *The Religion exerciſed*, Though it is no Demonſtration at *Oxon*, that *they are falſe*, becauſe *the* Scotch *Army made them a Preſence to get Money with:* yet, being they are, as Mr. *Cr.* acknowledges, *private men*; he muſt alſo acknowledge, it concerns only thoſe *private men* to defend them. But, from *that Anſwer* of his, I ſhall conclude a little farther, and over-throw it by its own ſelf; prove *what it denies*, out of *what it grants*. For, it is in it ſelf very clear, ſeeing *the Quarrel* was at *the Religion exerciſed*, not *eſtabliſhed*; Thoſe Opinions, called *the exerciſed*

Religion, ought only to have been *diſcarded*, and the *eſtabliſht Doctrine* have been made the Rule to *reform by*; by which they might have had *the Law*, and *their Adverſaries* too, on their ſide. But, becauſe they name another Rule, It is plain, they mean *to alter that too*; and, ſo are lyable to thoſe inconveniencies Mr. *Cr.* endeavours to free them from, by a ſtrained Interpretation, which their *words* and *actions* are no way capable of. Though it is a pretty ſtrange account of bringing *Englands eſtabliſhed Religion* to *the Scotiſh mode*, by Allegations out of Authors, which are contended for, to be no part of *that Religion ſo eſtabliſhed.*

Mr. *Cr.* doth indeed ſet ſeveral *Doctrines*, and name *Authors*, many of which have been eminently uſeful to this *Church*, and therefore hated by *Rome*, and *Scotland*: but being there are no *references* to any part of their *Works*; with *what ſincerity* it

it is done, *I am not able to say*: But I may guess it to be done with *very little*, if I may conclude by one which I single out: because that sort of people have so *little shame* or *conscience* as to Preach it down to the people as *Arminianism*. It is p. 47. *That men had free will of themselves to believe and repent*: he may justly say, *The University* was poysoned with *Arminianism*, if this hortid Tenent was owned and there countenanced. *Arminians* need not be angry, that they are *slandered*; for that is a tacit Confession: there is not *truth* enough to object against them. Men must *bely* them, to make them *odious*; part with their *own Innocency* to *darken theirs*. But I much wonder Mr. *Cr.* should tell the Masters of *Oxf.* That, *This Tenent among others was defended by them from censure*. Though people are apt to *believe* any thing of *Papists* & *Arminians*; yet the *Oxf.* men are not so apt to *believe* any story *of themselves*. They *challenge* all the world to tell *when*,

and by *whom* they defended that horrid Doctrine from *censure*. The utmost ground of this *accusation*, is, some men in *Oxf.* might possibly affirm, they understood not what it was to be made *willing* whether *we would or no*; how *freedom* and *force*, *liberty* and *necessitation*, were the same thing. This is far enough from the purpose. But *censure* is there a *judicial word*. I demand therefore, Whether the University defended the men he means from *the censure of those who had authority to censure them*; or from *those who had nothing to do in the matter*. If from the former, I desire to know, How it was possible for them to *do it*, and when they *did it*? If from the latter, those who had nothing to do with it; sure the *harm* is not great.

If I should grant all the *Tenents* he reckons up to be *false*, because it were perhaps too hard to *prove* them to one who would *deny* it; I do not

not apprehend the considerable advantage he would get by it toward *his Cause*, because they are only *particular mens*. He will not sure think himself concerned in all we can prove preached in *Camp*, and *City*, and the men not only defended against the *King* and the *Laws*; but encouraged, applauded, and preferred. Might not men safely preach at *London*, *Believers* to *be above all Ordinances*, but *those of the two Houses*. Was any more care taken at *London* (even when *the Covenant* was Triumphant, and set up in Churches instead of *the Lords Prayer*, and *Ten Commandements*) of what Opinions men were of, any more then of what Countrey, if they would but *fight* against *the King*? Was there any *Heresie*, but *Loyalty*? or *Common Enemy*, but *the King*? Might not those take the Scripture *in any* or *no sense*, who would take *the Laws* in *equitable sense*? It is altogether as reasonable

to pull down *Presbytery*, because there were *Independents* in *the Parliaments Army*; as they to *Covenant* us into *the Doctrine of the Church of* Scotland, because some men preached what *their ablest Defender* acknowledges no part of *the Doctrine of the Church of* England. And this is equal, *supposing* those Doctrines *false*, which as yet are only said to be so.

But at last comes an Attempt to answer those *Arguments*, the force of which Mr. *Cr.* hath hitherto evaded by pretences, wch I have proved (and perhaps himself perceived) groundless. *It will not* (saith he, p. 49.) *justifie the Recusancy of the Papists, because these things were never a reason of it.*

This *answer* is none at all: because, if *those things* to which *their conformity* was required were *really sins*, we cannot at all *blame*, nor *justly punish them* for refusing to be partakers *in them*; It is not easie to think

think of any thing which would more pleaſe them in, or juſtifie them for, *diſobeying our eſtabliſhed Laws*, than our proclaiming them thus to be *groſly horrid*, ſo apparently abominable, as there was an unavoidable neceſſity of uſing the worſt of remedies, a *Civil War*; and the worſt of dangers, *hazarding our ſouls* in the moſt ſuſpicious of actions, *the defiance of our Prince*; to remove them. It is from hence, (if this be once granted,) clear, we have all along *puniſhed Papiſts*, for *not conforming* to what it is a Chriſtians duty *not to conform to*. And this is, ſure, a competent ground for not aſſenting to this part of *the Covenant*; for, be the grounds of *ſinfulneſs what it will*, our ſelves by this ſhould own *that to be ſin* which we puniſhed them for *not joyning in*: the conceſſion of which would be ſo pleaſing to them, that I wonder to ſee thoſe men *plead* for it, who make *ſpite*

to *Rome* the only *rule* they walk by.

As to the second part of *the scandal*, justifying *the Separatists*, Mr. *Cr.* answers not much better. p. 50. *Neither can such an acknowledgment justifie the Separatists: For, that the corruptions established, were never made such Essential parts of the Worship, as to make a sufficient ground for separation; and the godly Non-conformists contended against separation.* This seems to me a very pretty Argumentation. There was no necessity to *separate* from *the Church* as it was *by Law established in Discipline, Ceremonies, &c.* yet there was a necessity to pull it down [*lest we be partakers of other mens sins, and so of their plagues*, &c.] with other such like phrases as *the Covenant* expresses it. Sure I am, if there was no sufficient ground for *separation*, there was no sufficient ground for *a Covenant* to reform in so *violent*

lent a way; and, to pull down that *Church*, from which there was ſufficient reaſon in your own judgement to *ſeparate*. If, as you truly urge, *Our Saviour kept Communion with a Church much in need of Reformation, and taught men ſo to do*; I would willingly learn, Who taught men to *take up Arms*, to deſtroy what you acknowledge to be only ſuch a Church. If there was no *neceſsity* for even thoſe, who did not approve *the Worſhip* and *Ceremonies*, to *ſeparate*; as you do, and ſay *the godly Nonconformiſts alwayes did*: What imaginable *neceſsity* could there be for theſe *Engliſh* men, who were ſubjects, and the *Scots* ſtrangers, to compel by force *Prince* and *People*, who approve of both, to *ſwear* it down.

Now come (p. 53.) ſome Endeavours to prove *the Doctrine* and *Diſcipline* of this *Church* to be not agreeable to the Word of God. Firſt, Can. 36. *Enjoyns Common Prayer*,

er, and no other, which they had broke by Praying at St. Maryes, *and is it ſelf, a limitation of the Spirit,* &c.

To the firſt, That the Church ever intended to *bind men* to ſay thoſe *Prayers* in the Pulpit before Sermon, is not true; but contrary to her own *Laws* and *practice*. Thoſe *univerſal words* muſt (as all others of that ſort are to be) be referred *ad ſubjectam materiam*. *The Liturgy* was made for (what indeed it is, and hath approved it ſelf to be, ſo far as *skill* and *malice* never queſtioned, but *carped* only at particular *phraſes*,) it was made I ſay, only, for *a Compleat Form of Publick Prayer*, comprehenſive of all our common needs imaginable; from whence, none could pretend upon that ſcore, reaſon to vary. But it was never intended *to baniſh occaſional Prayers*, (of which nature thoſe before Sermons are: for, which, a peculiar Canon is provided, and that penned in words which admit of latitude,

I ſup-

I ſuppoſe, becauſe they are looked upon as *occaſional*, and ſo may better endure to be *various*.

Limitation of the Spirit, is a phraſe equally admired by thoſe who underſtand nothing, as laught at by thoſe who do: It is vulgarly granted, but upon what reaſons I could never yet learn; That [*Praying by the Spirit*] ſignifies in Scripture [*To pray* Ex tempore] Though to me it ſeems rather a ſign of a *voluble tongue* then *inſpired heart*; and *to pray* without *conſidering*, is rather, I ſhould think, *boldneſs* then *grace*. But if that be the import of that phraſe, as *Women* and *Lecturers* generally hold; *the Prayer* of *Chriſt* is leaſt ſaid by *the Spirit* of *Chriſt*; and ſo the moſt *unacceptable Prayer* we can put up to him in all the world is *his own*.

But now I begin to think on that *phraſe*, I profeſs my ſelf unable to underſtand it; which makes me think, the reaſon many do not apprehend when

when the Argument drawn from thence is answered, is, Because they do not know what it means. It would be no inconsiderable damage to the *Puritan Cause*, if they would explain those terms, *Limitation of the Spirit*. I will pawn my Credit on it, the very admiring Rowt shall laugh at it the very same moment they understand it; the whole force of it consisting like that of a *charm*, in being *unintelligible*. Whatever I can guess it to be according to those principles and purposes it is used for, amounts clearly to this; He *limits the Spirit* in himself, who gives over while he hath *one word* left to say: and he *limits* it in another, when he *suffers* any body to *hear* him; because he *confines* him to his *words*, when *the Spirit* might possibly suggest to him *different*. And this is really so in every Auditory, unless we can suppose that every man there, (were he called to exercise) would use the same *matter* and *words*, which he

he who carryeth on *the work* of *the day* doth make use of.

But some men have ventured to say and prove too, (which I wonder Mr. *Cr.* took no notice of it, if he thought it possible to answer it) That *the Directory* it self was guilty of this *evil*, viz. *Limiting the Spirit* (if it be an *evil*) wch it was intended to remove. That *Directory prescribed matter*, and in most cases the very *order* of *Praying*. Seeing it *prescribes the matter*; the only excellency whereby it differs, is, it gives weak and careless that men (which are by much the *major part*) leave to choose *words* unapt to express that *matter* it self *prescribes*. It hath then all the real inconveniences of *unprescribed Prayers*, and that one fancyed one of *prescribed*.

The second Exception of his (p. 54.) is very *Tragical* and *mounting*; In comes *great zeal* and *little wit*, and tells us of a *fault* so very gross, that the very plain *Popish*, *Scotch*,

Scotch Service-Book, ſhall be commended for not being guilty: *The very firſt ſentence (ſo called) of Scripture is not there; At what time ſoever a ſinner doth repent*, &c.

I perſwade my ſelf, Mr. *Cr.* hath read in the *New-Teſtament* of proofs alleadged out of the *Old*, barely according to the *ſenſe*, the expreſs words whereof are no where to be found; the inſtances are various, I mention but one, *Mat. 2. 6.* taken out of *Micah* 5. 2. But what need I ſtand to prove, that ſome men can very be *angry* when there is little *cauſe* for it?

Nor ſcape we ſo: and therefore Thirdly, In the laſt we did read that which is not Scripture; now we do not read what confeſſedly is. *Much of the Canonical Scripture is omitted, Apocrypha read, ſome parts of the Scripture dignified above others, as the Goſpel by ſtanding*, &c.

Many

Many Chapters of the *Canonical Scripture* not being read in *course*, was one of the *mighty faults* the *wiſe Aſſembly* took upon them to *mend*, and it amounted to this. When the vulgar people came to Church to hear *the Law* of *God* according to which they muſt *frame their lives*; a conſiderable part of the year they cauſed to be ſpent in *Genealogies*, or leſs *Edifying Hiſtory*, which could not but have had the ſame effect upon the people read in *Hebrew*, as *Engliſh*; or elſe the *Ceremonial Law*, which at this day concerns no body, and never did concern them at all. This was ſo apparently abſurd, that no imaginable account can be given of it, beſides that (not very Chriſtian) reſolution of *ſpite* and *ſingularity*; or that politick *Art* of not receiving *Pay*, *Preferment*, and *Applauſe*, without ſeeming to do ſomething for it.

Our

Our *Dignifying* (as they phraſe it) *ſome parts of Scripture above other, as the Goſpel by ſtanding*, is a thing which provokes their anger; and Mr. *Cr.* like an angry Diſputant confutes himſelf. Is that our fault, that we ſhew a *peculiar reſpect* to that part of it, which *peculiarly* concerns our *Saviour*, his *Words* and *Works*? Our particular obligation aſſures us, it were ill if it were otherwiſe. *Outward Reverence* (provided we do not let it ſerve in ſtead of, but uſe it to ſignifie and promote *inward*) cannot in that caſe be a crime. But if to *dignifie ſome parts of Scripture above others* be a crime, themſelves are guilty: as doing ſo to the *Pſalms* of *David*, (only they are not *Davids*, but *Sternholds*) by ſinging them before every Sermon, a thing in Scripture no where commanded. But ſo have I ſeen a diſtempered perſon in *ſpite* to another *beat* himſelf.

The

The next thing considerable, is, (p. 55, 56.) *Christmas, Easter, &c. and the Holy-days, are superstitious, plainly repugnant to* Gal. 4. 10. Col. 2. 16.

If the *Feasts* there mentioned, were evidently not *Christian Festivals*: I suppose, I may safely conclude *Christian Festivals* not to be plainly forbid in that place, where they are not so much as spoke of. The Text in the *Galatians* mentions expressly *Moneths* and *Years*, proportions of *Time*; no way to be accommodated to *Christian Festivals*, or then, or now. That in the *Colossians* is so plain, that it must be a worse Principle than Inconsideration, which occasioned the mistake; not only, because it expresses *New Moons*; (a thing not established by *Christian Authority*:) but, in the words following the 17. verse, gives a clear account of the *unlawfulness* of those *Feasts*, of the Observance of which he there complains, [*which are a shadow of things*

to come, but the Body is Christ]. Those *Feasts* therefore were not reproved, as having been commanded by any *Christian Church*, (which, it is clear, they were not:) but, because they had in them not only a *general malignity*, as being kept in *Obedience* to the *Jewish Law*, and so must suppose that to be still in *force*; but had besides a *peculiar malignity* in their *nature*; being (and for that very reason reproved) *a shadow of Christ to come*, and so consequently denyed *His coming*. Now then, all which can be gathered from this place, is, *Christians* must not keep *Feasts* which prefigured *Christ to come*; *Ergo*, they may not keep *Feasts* in remembrance that *He is come*.

There is a pretty piece of Divinity (*p.* 56.) to enforce the former Conclusion, which no doubt would be admirable, if it were but sense. *To observe the Nativity, Circumcision, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, severally*;

severally; is irrational and irreligious: irrational, because they are not in themselves Mercies to the Church, but as they center in Mans Redemption; irreligious, because without Divine warrant. That none of all these signal condescensions of *Divine goodness*, should be esteemed in themselves *Mercies*, or worth giving *thanks* for, when *Edge-Hill*, and *Nasby Battails*, though but in order to the *undoing* of *the King*, were so accounted; argues a more passionate esteem and concernment for *the Covenant* of *Scotland*, than that of *Grace*.

That it is *irreligious*, because without *Divine warrant*, is said, but not proved; For a thing becomes *unlawful*, only by being *against some Law*; that is, by being *forbidden*, not barely by being *not commanded*. Our Saviour Christ, we are sure, *observed Feasts*, which had not such *Institution*, notwithstanding that *prohibition*, which was as strict to the

Jews, whose Authority instituted those *Feasts*, and in *obedience* to which He kept them, as it can possibly be to us. Ye shall not add &c. Christ did indeed abolish *the Ceremonial Law* of the *Jews*, (and, that was all He did abolish, so as to make *unlawful*.) From hence men gather, That it is *no sin* for us to *imitate* them in any thing we find done by them according to *the Principles* and *Dictates* of *Nature*, *Gratitude*, &c. as *Feasts* of *Commemorations* clearly are. Though this is a Proposition sufficiently distant; upon this pitiful ground (without any more ado) do men *put off all*, which can be fetcht out of the *Old Testament*; whereas though Christ abolisht the *Ceremonial Law*, he left *all other Laws* and *Rules* as he found them, But, as Christ *observed Feasts* not *instituted* by *divine Authority*; so possibly doth Mr. *Cr.* the *command* in *Scripture* for *Sunday* being not so very clear, that Mr. *Cr.* cannot but

doubt to be *Irreligion* and *Will-worſhip* in his notions of thoſe terms. No man can ground it on the *fourth Commandement*, that doth not take the *ſeventh* and *firſt* to be the ſame day, *i. e. Seven* and *one* to be the ſame *number*. If he will interpret *the Seventh-day* to ſignifie *one in ſeven*: I deſire to know, whether *the Jews* might have obſerved which of the ſeven days they *pleaſed*; and whether then the Reaſon of the *fourth Commandement* was not ſtrangely impertinent to *the Matter* of it. That being expreſſed to be (*For in the Seventh day God reſted*, &c.) ſeeing that was the very *ſeventh*, and *no other*; and *a command* in *the New-Teſtament* for it, I ſuppoſe, is not to be found.

The next three leaves 57, 58, 59. are ſpent in proving what none ever denyed, That, *There are ſeveral things in the Form of our Service and Diſcipline not commanded in the*

Word of God. A *thing* comes to be *unlawful*, ſure, by being *forbid*; not by being *uncommanded.* Seeing this is the only *fault*; I ask, Is *the Directory*, the *Form* there preſcribed, in *the Word* of *God?* I deſire a direct Anſwer to that. Can that pretend to anything but to be the reſult of *Prudence* and *Authority?* Both *Directory* and *Common-Prayer* agree in that, which *the Directory* was made to differ from *the Liturgy* in; both were made by Men. The only imaginable difference is; the one was made by thoſe who *had Authority*, the other by thoſe who *had none.*

That *the Scripture* is *a compleat Rule* of *Faith.* And what cannot be *proved thereby*, as it is interpreted by that *Original* and unqueſtionable *Tradition*, by which we receive *the Scripture* it ſelf, is not to be believed as a revealed *Article* of *Faith.* We not only aſſert, but in the defence of this Practice of ours, whereby we are

ſaid

ſaid to *over-throw the Scriptures* being *a compleat Rule*, we contend for it as an advantagious *Truth* in *this Cauſe*: Becauſe, this Doctrine, Nothing is to be in *Diſcipline*, or *Order*, but what we find in *Scripture*, is a Doctrine in *Scripture* no where to be found. So, that the very Accuſation is the ſame Crime it would be thought to reprove. And, what is clear concerning this *Principle*, is as clear concerning their *Practice*; Till *the Form* and *Order* in *the Directory* preſcribed, be ſhewed to be ſo in *the Bible* too. *The demand* of *the Written Word* for every particular of *Order* and *Diſcipline* is hugely plauſible and ſenſeleſs. I will not throw away *Reaſon* upon *unreaſonable men*, to ſhow the vanity of that admired *tenent*; That whatever (though but of *Order*, *Decency*, *Diſcipline*,) is not in *the Written Word*, which is *a compleat Rule* for all, is *Will-Worſhip*, &c. I ſhall, for quiets ſake, grant *the Scripture*

to be ſo; and, that *the Directory*, or any other *beloved way*, is plainly *in terminis* in the Bible. But then, I ſhall require this in return, that they would ſhow me *where-abouts*, for I would willingly *read it there*; and truly, this is but reaſonable. They, who when we obey *the Church*, though in matters of *Order* and *Decency*, tell us, *We hang our Faith upon the Churches ſleeve*, (though, by the way, the word [*Faith*] is not very properly applyed to ſuch matters); They of all men ſhould not require us to *hang* our *eyes* upon *their ſleeves*; believe that *Form* to be plainly in *Scripture*, which we who know our ſelves able to *read*, know not to be *there*; let them but ſhew it us *there*, and we will *believe*. Themſelves approve not, they tell us, *Believing by an implicit Faith*, and we as little like *to ſee* with *implicit eyes*.

That *things indifferent* are not *unlawful to be uſed*, becauſe *commanded*,

ed, we need no other Principle but their own; That *Humane Commands* alter not *the Nature of things*, *Ergo*, They do not become *unlawful* by its; *Ergo*, they may even then be *used without sin*; and if so, Whether then it be not *a duty*, I leave to him to consider, who remembers *Obedience* to *all Magistrates Civil* and *Ecclesiastical* to be enjoyned in the terms of the greatest latitude? Those general Commands signifie something: sure, the general Rule of *Decency* and *Order* were not intended for nothing. St. *Paul* reproved *the irregularities* at *Corinth*, upon other Principles then would admit the *wild extravagancies* of any thing that might be mistook for, or called, *Tender Conscience*. *If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor the Churches of God.* So then, to plead *Christian Liberty* against the *Customs of the Church*, is indeed *spiritual Pride, Faction, Singularity*,

gularity, though it may be called *Conſcience*. There was a diſorder in the Church of *Corinth*, as we read, Chap. 14. v. 23. St. *Paul* rectified it by the Rules of *Decorum*, the Principles of Reaſon, without any reference to the revealed Will of God. [*Will they not ſay, Ye are mad?*] In the 26. of that Chapter, he tells them, One had *a Pſalm*, another *a Doctrine*, a third *a Revelation*, &c. Every one after his own way: as, if there be no *common Authority* which hath power to *reſtrain*, what can hinder? It is very probable, it was upon this very miſtake of *the Liberty* given by *Chriſt*, as appears in the cloſe of the Diſcourſe, ver. 33. *God is not the Author of Confuſion*, &c. *i. e.* They miſtake the matter quite, Chriſt indeed aboliſht the *Laws* of *Moſes*, but never told them he did thoſe of *Decency*: He never inſtituted *Ordinances* of *diſorder*, or *Sects* of *rudeneſs*. And, if there muſt be

be *Decency*, and *Order*, no *confusion*: If *Authority* must not *judge* what is so, but every private man for himself; then I would fain know, how *Order* differs from *Disorder*. Though this is clear in the nature of the thing; yet I shall show out of Scripture it self, allowed Instances of the *Churches Authority* exercised over, and altering of, *Institutions* confessedly immediate of *divine Institution*. At the Institution of the Pass-over, *Exod.* 12. 11. it is commanded expresly, they should eat it in that manner, *with their loins girt, shoes on their feet, staves in their hands*: yet our Saviour according to the allowed and accustomed practise of that Church, eat it in *a Table-posture*, His *loyns not girt*, nor His *staff in his hand*. Now what account can be given of this matter by those who allow the Church in matters of this nature no *Power*, but declaratory what *the written Word* in this case

which

(which every Cobler who can read, hath) let themselves tell us? The practice of the *Kings* in varying, as occasion served, in such cases from *the Law* is mentioned and commended in *Scripture*, and hath been often urged in this case. The Truth, as well as the Practise, is clear; *That the nature of Government can no more be devested of this Power, than it can of being what it pretends to be.* This *power* of *varying* with occasions from the very express Letter of Scripture, *the Presbyterians* as well as all the rest of the world *allow* and *practise*. *The Eucharist* was not instituted to be in *the morning*, nor at *the Publike Service*. The Decree *Act.* 15. of *things strangled*, and *bloud*, though made by the authority and direction of *God Himself*, and in peremptory terms, is not observed; and he who says, *The Reason* of that *Command ceases*, doth not answer, but confirm my *Argument*, That in *change* of *Times* we

may

may *alter* what is *eſtabliſhed* in Scripture: much more Power, ſure, we have over what is not at all mentioned there. *The Order of Widows*, treated of in the fifth Chap. of the 1 of *Timothy*, no where now. *The famous Love-Feaſts*, every where ceaſed. Let them not delude the World with a ſhew of *Scripture-Diſcipline*, when of that little part which is come to our knowledge, themſelves *retain nothing*. Though how according to their Principles who allow *no Authority in the Church*, but confine it to *the Written Word*, be our *Times* never ſo different, they can omit or add any *tittle* without the moſt *horrid Impiety*, I underſtand not.

There is a Query, *p.* 59. which they are very happy in, having taken generally for granted. Sure I am, They cannnot ſay one word of ſenſe to prove it. *Whether the Inſtituting ſignificant Ceremonies be not the very Formality of Superſtition?* I am very

very confident, were not our *Ceremonies significant*, they would be ſtyled *filly* and *uſeleſs*; and now they are *ſignificant*, they are *Impious*. To the Query I ſay this; The word *Superſtition* (δεισιδαιμονία) is uſed ſeveral times in Scripture: but in what place they can pretend it to have that *meaning*, I wiſh they would conſider *firſt*, and tell us *afterward*. The Criticks, I ſuppoſe, will not befriend them with ſuch a notion of it in the learned Authors. I find St. *Paul* charging the *Athenians*, *Act.* 17. 22. downright with this crime, *Ye are too Superſtitious*. I ſuppoſe Mr. *Cr.* will not prove the very *formality* of their *fault*, to be *ſignificant Ceremonies*. I find in Scripture *a ſignificant Ceremony*, viz. *The Holy kiſs*. If it was inſtituted by the Apoſtles as they were *Ordinary Governours of the Church*, in that capacity they were to have *Succeſſors* while there is *a Church* or *World*; and ſo it proves *the Churches*

Power

Power to inſtitute *ſignificant Ceremonies*. If they did it as Apoſtles, it concerns us now.

The moſt material Objection is, *p. 60. How comes it to paſs, that the work of the Miniſtery is divided in Ordination, Deacons Baptize but adminiſter not the Lords Supper?*

That *the Church* ſhould give power to *Deacons to Baptize*, though not to *adminiſter the Sacrament* ſome account may be given from the different natures of both *Sacraments*. Both of them, it is confeſſed, are *equally Holy*, yet were alwayes looked upon with ſome *difference*: that of *Baptiſm* as of greater *neceſsity*; that of *the Lords Supper*, as of greater *ſolemnity*, and conſequently requiring greater *preparation*. Yet *Baptiſm* alwayes ſo eſteemed, as not to be adminiſtred by *a Deacon*, but in the abſence of *a Prieſt*. The great clamor amounts to this then, *The Sacrament of Baptiſm*, becauſe of the ſudden occaſions which

which may often require *haſte*, hath therefore been thought fit by the wiſdom of *the Church* (rather than *the adminiſtration* thereof in caſe of *danger* ſhould be *omitted*) to be permitted to be performed by a *Deacon*, in caſe *a Prieſt* be not at hand to perform it. The caſe in *the Lords Supper* is clear otherwiſe; becauſe, that is not uſually adminiſtred without *publike notice* given to the *People* ſome convenient time before, when it ſhall be done; at which time, it is preſumed, *the Prieſt* who gave *the notice*, will be preſent to attend *the ſervice*. There is a clear diſparity in *the Natures* of *the two Sacraments*; thoſe Reaſons which Apologize for *Permiſſion* in caſe of *the one*, will by no means reach *the other*. Nor do we want evidence for *the Deacons power* to *Baptize*, out of Scripture it ſelf. In the 8. of the *Acts*, we read, that *Philip the Deacon* (ver. 12.) *Baptized*; that it was that *Philip*,

not

not *the Apoſtle*, appears, becauſe we find *Peter* and *John* ſent to *lay hands on thoſe* he preached to, that they might *receive the Holy Ghoſt*, and accordingly we read, that they two did *lay their hands*; but no manner of intimation, that he did *joyn with them*: which he would certainly have done, had he been an *Apoſtle*. In the 21. of the *Acts*, where his being *one of the ſeven*, i. e. *a Deacon*, is expreſly mentioned, he is there owned an *Evangeliſt*, though but *a Deacon*. He who will ſay, he was *a Presbyter*, ought well to conſider how to prove it.

The next of the *Oxf. Reaſons*, is; That in *taking this Oath*, they ſhould *break another*. And, what ſecurity can they expect by an *Oath*, who themſelves teach men to *break them*? By *this Covenant* they ſwear to *alter* what they had by *the Parliaments Order* ſworn to *maintain*, in the Proteſtation 5. of *May*, 1641. Which

Mr. *Cr.* thus reconciles, *p.* 65. *The House of Commons, the then known Legislators, explained the Protestation, to be meant only so far as is opposite to Popery.* That is to say, *The House of Commons* are *Legislators* distinct from *King* and *Peers*: For in that capacity they made that *interpretation* of an *Oath*, w^ch^, sure, they were not *solely to interpret*, because they were not *the sole Imposers*, and they declared *the Lords meaning* contrary to their Lordships express *protest* to the contrary, that that was not their *meaning*. Their being *sole Legislators* in *defiance* of *King* and *Peers*, (for so it was in that case;) is very prety Doctrine, which I would have been glad to have seen *one Law* to have *proved*. I wonder Mr. *Cr.* should think it would be taken for granted. But indeed, Mr. *Cr.* hath one expression which could not have been well spared, *The House of Commons were then known to be*, &c. I must confess, there were many prety things

things *then known to be*, though no man knew why. The words of the Proteſtation, [*The Proteſtant Religion expreſſed in the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *&c.*] Now what is in *the* 39. *Articles*, is, I ſuppoſe, *The Doctrine of the Church of* England: and then if *the Covenant* be contrary to any of thoſe, theſe are *contradictory Oaths*. The 36. *Article*, which declares, that there is nothing, in *the Book of Conſecration, ſuperſtitious or ungodly*, is hardly reconcileable to *the ſecond Article of the Covenant*. Sure, the meeting of *the Aſſembly* is irreconcileable with the 21. *Article*, if we ſuppoſe *His Majeſty* was *a King* at that time. As to the explication of it, by *the Houſe of Commons*, notwithſtanding *the Lords expreſs diſſent*; it was an arrogating of *the whole Parliamentary Power* (and more) to themſelves ſolely, and ſo a breach of *the Fundamental Conſtitution* of that *Aſſembly*. And then declaring

none *fit* to bear *Office* but those who would except of that *explication*, and so concur with, and assist them in that *violence*; was against *the Liberty of the Subject*, as depriving Men of what they had no way legally forfeited. Where *the Legislative Power* resides, I do not here mean to decide: But certainly, according to the worst Principles then owned, *The Commons* were not *the sole Legislators*; and then, sure, not *the sole Interpreters*: and therefore the *Oxf.* Men had very little cause to accept of their *meaning* for *Authentick*. That Man is little *obeyed*, whose *words* must be taken in *the sense* that another (and he, as frequently in our case, his *declared Enemy*) shall put upon them.

The next is, *The consistency of the Covenant* with *the Oath of Supremacy*, which binds us to defend all *Jurisdictions, Priviledges, Preheminencies*, granted, or belonging, united

or

or annexed to the *Imperial Crown* of this *Realm*: of which in the 25 *Hen.* 8. *c.* 19. this is one; That *the Clergy are not to Enact, Promulge,* &c. *any new Canons, Constitutions,* &c. *or by whatever Name they shall be called, unleſs the KINGS ROYAL Aſſent firſt be had to make, promulge,* &c. Now the very *meeting* of *the Aſſembly*, and *this Covenant*, was *a defiance* to this *His Prerogative*: unleſs the Votes of *the two Houſes* be the *KINGS ROYAL Aſſent*.

Mr. *Cr.* anſwer to this, is, (*p.* 67.) in ſhort, High Treaſon. *That the Power given to the King, is ſuch a Power, as Biſhops, Cardinals, Popes had uſed, not ſuch as Parliaments; who ever retained a Juriſdiction in themſelves over Church and Crown.* As I underſtand *words*, *Your Majeſties humble and Loyal Subjects aſſembled in Parliament*, ſignifies not *your Lords and Maſters*. How comes *Treaſon*

to be againſt *the King*, and not againſt *them*, if they are *Supream?* How come they to have *ever retained a Juriſdiction over the Crown*; when our Law ſo often owns *all Juriſdiction to flow from the Crown?* How comes *the Kings Maſters* to be ſo abſolutely at *His diſpoſal*, as to be *turned out* as eaſily as it is poſſible for him to *ſay ſo?* How comes *England*, in our own and other *Chronicles*, and *Laws*, to be ſtyled *a Monarchy*, *an Imperial Crown?* How comes it to paſs that we neither pay nor promiſe *Allegiance* to *theſe our true Soveraigns?* The King is expreſly called *ſole Supream Governour* in the Oath of Supremacy; and yet he hath *Superiours*. Sharing in *the Supremacy* with *the King* was all, I had thought, would have been *required*: not *retaining Juriſdiction over him*. I wonder, if this be true, That Mr. *Cr.* did ſo prevaricate with his Brethren, when *he pleaded* (as he calls it) *for the King:* when it was indeed only

againſt

againſt *the Sectaries*; and ſo was not *Loyalty*, but *Spite*. But, why did he, if this be true, urge *Precepts* for, and *Examples* of, *Obedience* out of *Scripture*, and *the Primitive Church* (though by the way, they were ſuch as *themſelves* had before taught them to *ſlight* or *anſwer*)? Why did he *urge them*, when they reached not *the caſe*? For thoſe *Princes* were confeſſedly *Supream*. Our *King* it ſeems *is not*: not *God's Vicegerent*, but *the Peoples Officer*; from whom he received *his Power*, and is but *Tenant at Will* at beſt. They ſtill retaining *Juriſdiction over him*, may abridge it at pleaſure. He is a ſtranger in *England*, that doth not know *all Land* to be held of *the Crown*; and every one of us pays *acknowledgment* that we received it from thence: and all manner of *Juriſdiction* to be owned in Law to proceed from *the King*, without the leaſt concurrence of *the two Houſes*. In *England*, when any doth *Homage*, *Fealty*, &c. in their

Oath they perpetually have *a Salvo*, of ſaving their *Faith* to other *Lords*. In *the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy*, we find no ſuch *ſalvo* of our *Faith* to *the two Houſes*. No not if any of us take them during their *Seſſion*, do we promiſe any *equal Allegiance*. But the very *Members* do promiſe Allegiance to *the King*: inaſmuch as no *Member*, though never ſo fairly elected, can ſit without taking *thoſe Oaths*. But, according to this Doctrine of *Juriſdiction over the King*, never any Laws in the World were ſo ſottiſhly penned as the *Engliſh*: to place all *Marks of Soveraignty*, where it is not; and none at all where it is. Nay, that the very *two Houſes*, when they ſend to *the King*, as in that capacity, ſhould *Petition their Inferiour*; and acknowledge themſelves *Humble*, *Loyal*, and *Obedient Subjects* to him, over whom they *ever retained Juriſdiction*. *Ever retained!* O the brave *Engliſh Monarchy of the two Houſes of Parliament!*

ment! This is a ſtrange concealed *Juriſdiction of the two Houſes*, which never any *King owned*, or *Parliament claimed*. When King *James* came in, he ſhould have recognized *them*, not they *him*: Nor was that *Parliament faithful* either to *King* or *Country*, in concealing ſo *important a concernment*. I will cite but *one Law*, and that not *Ancient*; for none, I think, can doubt its Opinion in this point, but one. When the aſſent of the two Houſes to *Law-making* was required; and after thoſe words (ſo much, to ſerve ſome mens turns, wreſted beyond their import) *Be it Enacted by the King, Lords, and Commons* came in faſhion. It is *Anno* 24 *Hen.* 8. *c.* 12. 'Whereas by ſundry old Authen-'tick Hiſtories, it is manifeſtly ex-'preſſed, That this *Realm* of *England*, 'is an Empire governed by *One Su-'pream Head* and *King*, having the 'Dignity and Royal Eſtate of the *IM-'PERIAL Crown* of this *Realm*; un-

to

'to whom *a Body Politick* compact of 'all ſorts and degrees of People, and 'divided in terms, and by names, of 'Spiritualty & *Temporalty* bin bound, 'and ought to bear, next to God, *a* 'natural and *humble Obedience*. If *the King* is next to *God*; what *Juriſdiction the two Houſes have over Him*, I profeſs my ſelf unable to comprehend: or how, owning *natural* and *humble Obedience* ſignifies *retaining Juriſdiction over Him*. But thoſe who are not of this wild Opinion, do yet embrace the ground of it, and ſtand ſtiff for *a ſhare* in *the Government*. Theſe two grounds Mr. *Cr.* often inſiſts upon, *That their Aſſent is neceſſary to the making and repealing Laws: and that the King receiving his Power from them, they reſerved a conſiderable part of it to themſelves*. The former I have ſpoken to in [*The Rebels Plea*] That that doth not at all evince any ſuch thing: and it is alſo falſe in Experience; for *the Monarchs* of

of *the East*, whom none ever ſuppoſed to have *ſharers in the Government*, could not *alter all their Laws at pleaſure*, &c. And I there referred to an Author who had ſo admirably ſtated that Point in *Law* and *Reaſon*, in that Incomparable Treatiſe [*The Caſe of our Affairs*], that nothing can be added on that *Head*, it is there done ſo fully and clearly. I think, it is not eaſie to ſhew ſuch a *King*, whoſe *Laws* are as *ambulatory* as his *pleaſure*; and yet, ſure, there are ſome whoſe Subjects are not *Partners* in *the Soveraignty*. And certainly, ſo long as *Kings* are but ſingle men, and not naturally ſtronger then all their *Subjects*; they muſt rule by the help and advice either of *Gentlemen*, or *Janizaries*. The former way is (I think) more honourable for *the King*, and better for *his People*. There can be no way of proving this Propoſition; unleſs it carries its own Evidence: which though generally

rally granted, I do not apprehend why. *The Prince promises not to exercise such a part of his Power, without the consent of his People*, Ergo, *They share with him in it*, is a consequence far from Necessary. When *Tenants* get *Rights* by *Promise*, *Grant*, or *Custom*; do they presently *share* in *the Dominion?* Is none a perfect *Landlord* that cannot *turn out all his Tenants*, as easily as *say so?* Can no man make another a firm Estate in *the Tenancy*, but *eo ipso* he makes him *his Co-Landlord?* Is it the same to have *sharers* in *the Authority*, and to be *limited* in *the exercise* of it? This is perfectly the case: *The King* hath granted to us, that he will not *alter our old Laws*, or *make new*, till by common consent it is represented to him expedient for *the Publique good*: from hence alone we gather that we *share* with him in *the making* of them.

As

As to the other Point, *That Princes received their Power by Election*, is a very *plauſible Impoßibility*. Let us conſider a *rude ſcattered multitude*, (as Men are ſuppoſed to have been, when they choſe *their firſt Governours*,) living *ſine Lege, ſine Lare*; to meet together about a buſineſs of *that nature*, where could not but be many, who apprehended it their Intereſt *to uſe Violence*. Can we ſuppoſe them all to carry it *fairly*, and *prudently*, and *equally*? A thing, which certainly we could not expect from the moſt *civilized Common-wealth* this day in the World. There could not want *bold Villains*, who would make it their *buſineſs*, to *uſurp Dominion* over their *well-meaning neighbours*. There could not but be many, who would think themſelves *wiſe enough to Rule*. Nor could there want enow, to make their *title* good by *ſtrong hand*, by the Combination though of *a very few*; and the Combination of *a very few*, could not

not but have overpowred *a very great* undiſciplined Rabble. Surely thoſe men were not of the ſame *ſpecies* with us; where a whole People meet together without *any force* over them; every one gives his *Vote freely*; every one names his *man*; every one *acquieſces*. It were certainly a pretty ſight, when all the World was *wiſe* and *innocent*; and, had it been ſo ſtill, they would have found no want of *vernment*. If the Original of Government, had been a *fair* and *free Election*; it is not at all probable, that the moſt *ancient Governments* would have been *Monarchies*. Not only for that to have made *more* then *one*, would have been a very good exdient to reconcile *competitors*: But becauſe it ſeems, alſo at the firſt ſight, better to truſt *more* then *One*. Or if they had been ſo; it is not like they would have been ſo *abſolute*. *Arkstria Principum pro legibus* was *a truſt* that would have ſeemed *too dange-*

rous;

rous: and, that *unlimited Power*, ſcarce fit to have been *exerciſed* over thoſe who made him *what he was*. Whereas we finde the moſt *Ancient Governours*, ſtill the moſt *abſolute*. The *ancient Hiſtorians* who tell us that *Government* at firſt came in *this way* of *Election*; becauſe they do not tell us in *particular*, but in *general* only: They dream to us, That *Governours* were of old dayes choſe for *vertue*, (the *Beſt* was made the *Greateſt*;) not as now, by *Fraud*, *Violence*, and *Money*, &c. Wherein there is a manifeſt ſpice of weakneſs, in doting upon thoſe who lived a great while ago; as if they were *better* then others: As old Men uſe to tell us, what *brave times* there were, when they were *boyes*. When *the Scripture* (which may at leaſt have the credit of *a Hiſtory* with us) aſſures us, that before *the times* they ſo much *applaud*, *The earth was filled with violence*. How they ſhould come

come to ſuppoſe ſo much *Innocency* in *mankind*, they never had *experience* of; might poſſibly be (as *all errours* are founded in *ſome truth*) ſome *obſcure Tradition* of *Adam* in his *innocency*. I know, it is ordinarily ſaid, *We are all Men, and a King is but ſo: We are all born free; and what He is more then us, is by our own Act.* Whereas the ground of this arguing, *we are born free*, is it ſelf a contradiction; inſomuch that whoever is *born*, is *eo ipſo* not *free*, as having *a Father* to whom he is *obliged* for all that he *hath*, or *is*. By him we were *begot*, and *nouriſhed*: and he who gave us our *life*, had anciently (before *Principalities* grew large) the *ſole power* of *taking it away*. That this *Paternity* was the *original* of *Power* in *England*; it is no *obſcure Evidence*, That *thoſe* to whom the greateſt ſhare of *the Adminiſtration* is committed, are to this day under the ſtyle of *the Kings Cozins* [*Cognato noſtro*]

ſo

ſo in the Writ whereby the Lords are called to Parliament) as if their *Proximity* in *blood*, were their *title* to their *Power*. If any tell me, *That I deviſe a title for Princes, that cannot be of any uſe; they not being able to ſhew their right to be Political Parents, by proving themſelves the true Heir to the Natural one of a whole Nation.* To this, I ſay, I have ſhewed a *title*, to which any other can as little *pretend* to, and ſo they are not at all *the worſe*. And no man can pretend *right*, that cannot ſhew himſelf that *very perſon*, whoſe *very place* I ſhew them to *poſſeſs*: and it is a rule in Law and Reaſon, That he who is *in poſſeſſion*, hath a *right* againſt all the World, but him who hath *the very right*. The *very right*, if the *preſent Princes* have not, none can pretend to; and if *any have, they have*: if *any other* had, *they have* certainly relinquiſhed it by ſo long *a Non-claim*. And to ſet up any *other Perſon*,

or *other Form* of *Government*, for a People to pretend, that becauſe they were brought to that *conſent by force*, and ſo not *obliged* any longer then *the force continueth*; is abſurd: and their *conſent* and *ſubmiſſion* is obligatory; becauſe it was *free*, though *forced*. *Free*, I ſay, though *forced*; I am not aſhamed to own that expreſſion: For, no *outward force* can *conſtrain* us to promiſe *Obedience* further then we our ſelves pleaſe. For it is a truth known by all who underſtand *Ethicks*, or *themſelves*; That whatever I do to avoid *a greater danger*, I do *willingly*: and as I judge it in that ſtate of affairs, (as taking it to be the *leſſer evil*,) I may rationally; and it is clear, I do *freely*, becauſe I do actually, *chooſe* it. If I part with *my liberty*; nay, with *my conſcience*, to gratifie him who hath *de facto* a power to *kill me*: in this later caſe as it is certain *I ſin*; It is as certain I do it *voluntarily*: becauſe

all

all ſins are ſo. For, if he *de facto* may *kill me*; and, that he may not uſe that *power*, I promiſe him to do *this*, or *that*: I have *quid pro quo*; my *life* for my *ſubjection*. He who might *kill me*, and ſo prevent all *the harm* it were poſſible for me to do, and upon my promiſe of *obedience*, lets me *live*; truſts me: and then if I am *falſe*, I break my *truſt*. Though he had no *right* to *force me* to make *the promiſe*; yet he hath an *unqueſtionable tye* upon me to the *thing promiſed*, even my *own promiſe*.

If it be here replyed, according to this; *All who were forced to take the Covenant, or engaged to the late Power*, &c. *are by this obliged to keep it.*

I anſwer, Firſt, I do not mean to make an *excuſe* for any who did either. But ſecondly, I deny *the Conſequence*: Becauſe, though I ſay, That our *own Act*, may deprive us of our *own Rights*; I neither ſay, nor think, that it can deprive a *third per-*

ſon of his: which was the caſe, as to *the King*, and all *the Biſhops*, and *Deans* and *Prebends*. Conſider though but as ſo many ſingle perſons of *the Covenant*, it binding us to deprive them of their *livelyhoods*, they had not been legally convict of *crimes* to *forfeit* the ſame: nor only doth it bind to deſtroy *their* Rights, but all *the Royal Party*; nay, all who had done any thing, which at any time was, or might be voted *malignity*, though it were but in living where *the King* took *Contribution*, when they had no where elſe to live. And theſe to be judged, not according to any Rule; but as, (according to the fourth Article; *The Supream Judicatories, or Committees from them ſhould think convenient*]. Though I affirm a mans *own act* may prejudice his *own right*: yet no man had ſuch *a right* over others concernments as to *ſubject* them to Committeemens *pleaſure*: and that will reach the caſe of *the Oath of Allegiance*,

it

it was not at his own diſpoſe to give it to any late Powers. I have contended againſt *the Government* being by compact, by having ſubmitted to the King: for be it *Paternity*, or *Conqueſt* in *a War*, juſt or unjuſt; it overthrows that Doctrine, of Parliaments *Ever retaining a Juriſdiction over Church and Crown*. But ſhould I grant the Original of Government to have been *compact*; it would not infer our *retaining Juriſdiction*: becauſe we might have *ſubmitted abſolutely*. If *Parliaments* have ſuch *a power*; they receive it from *the King*, or *People*. Not from *the King*, ſure; but if they have, let them ſhow it. Not from *the People*, as their *Repreſentatives*; for ſo *the Lords* are not at all concerned. If *the Commons* have it, they muſt ſhew when *the People gave it them*, (if they had it to *give*). Their *Writ* expreſſeth no ſuch thing; and *by Grant* they muſt have it. For *Aſſemblies* are not *born* but *conſtituted*:

their whole *Being*, or *Authority*, is purely derivative: and if they will ſay *by grant*; let them produce it.

But after all this, *the Covenant* is not *juſtifiable*, though the Parliament had ſuch a tranſcendent and unheard of Authority. For, being it is profeſſed in the Concluſion to be an incouragement to *Foraign Churches*, to enter into the *like Aſſociation* and *Covenant*, &c. where there is no ſuch pretence of *Parliamentary Power*: *the Covenant* conſequently muſt needs be *ſcandalous*, as inviting to down-right *Rebellion*; if there be a poſſibility for any ſuch thing as *Rebellion*; and ſo to *ſin*, if *Rebellion* be a *ſin*: and if it be not: I would fain know what is? And for the ſame reaſon, except *the two Houſes* be *Supream* in *Ireland* too; they cannot oblige us to *reform* that, where they as well as we have no *Authority*. Though *Ireland* is under the *Crown* of *England*; I ſuppoſe *the Crown* is not theirs.

The

The ſecond Article of the Covenant.

As an inducement to like well of *Epiſcopal Government*, the *Antiquity* and *Univerſality* of it is conſidered: an Argument worth conſidering at leaſt; certainly of moment, with any but thoſe who will not be perſwaded, that there ever were *pious* or *prudent men*, who *ſought God*, or were *directed by Him*, till the *Scottiſh Army* came into *England*. It is, certainly, free from that prejudice which lies againſt *the Covenant*; that *Biſhops Lands* were *Anti-Chriſtian* aſſoon as their *Calling* was. Men had got a very *fair Title* to *Biſhops Lands*, by *ſwearing* the Biſhops ſhould not *keep* them; as if *wrong* ceaſed to be *wrong*, when men entred into *a League* to do it. How *the Parliament* came to *the power* of diſpoſing of *Church Lands*; I am, (and believe they are too,) very *ignorant*. The *Biſhops* received their

Lands from them who were *the right owners*; and therefore certainly, had it in their *power* to *give* it to whom they would: nor were they by any Law disabled from giving it to that *particular use*. And I presume that that place in Scripture is not easily produced, *Where whatever is given to the Church, is declared forfeited to the State*. For the weight (I suppose) in the Argument, drawn from *the Antiquity* of *Episcopal Government*, is hardly avoided by that Text, *Redeemed from the vain conversation received by Tradition from their fathers*.

In his Answer to the *Oxf. Reasons*, Mr. *Cr.* urges *The Bishops constant struglings with, and encroaching on the Royal Authority*, &c. *p.* 73. The *strugling* of *Bishops* which he means, was in behalf of *Papal*, not *Episcopal Authority*. Sure, he hath forgot the Practise and Principles of the *Scottish Presbyters*: and the *English Promoters*

Promoters of *this Covenant* were, certainly, very great *encroachers* upon *the Royal Authority*; if *ROYAL* relates to *the KING*. Their Brethren in *Scotland*, whom they *Covenant* to be the ſame with; have ſtood in (and owned *the*) *Defiance* of *King* and *Parliament*, & claim *a coactive Power Independent* on either. *The Convocations* in *England* acknowledge themſelves to have *no power to Enact or Promulge any new Canons, without the Kings leave*. Which of the two are the *Encroachers* then, it is not hard to determine. *Si fur diſpliceat Verri, &c. The Diſciplinarian Calviniſts*, objecting *diſloyalty* to *Biſhops*, is like as *the Doctrinal* ones accuſed *the Arminians* of making God *the Author of ſin*, and *damning men* for what Himſelf had *neceſſitated* them to do. 'Tis a good way of *hanging others* for our *own faults*.

The next Crime is, *Puniſhing the beſt men for things indifferent*. i. e. *Diſobedience* to *ſuch commands* it could not be *unlawful* to *obey in*: be-

cauſe

cauſe *the things* were *indifferent*, *i. e.* ſuch as were not *unlawful*. If they were, as Mr. *Cr.* ſayes, *meer trifles*: it is no ſign of *the beſt men* to be *contentious* about *ſuch things*, about *trifles*. Some little prejudices againſt, or rather miſtakes about, *Epiſcopacy*, of no moment, I paſs over, and come to the Capital Objection, *p.* 75. *Epiſcopacy is a plain and clear Popery*, &c. *So ſay* Salmaſius *and* Beza, *Epiſcopi Papam pepererunt*. I do here very much queſtion, whether the Gentleman *believes himſelf*: and that not only, becauſe of the notoriouſneſs of the contrary evidencing thoſe *two Governments*, to all who underſtand the Conſtitution of them, to be not only *different*, but *inconſiſtent*. But alſo becauſe the granting of the *Jus Divinum* of *Epiſcopacy* would over-throw unavoidably that of *the Papacy*. And this is even by Mr. *Cr.* himſelf, before he thought on it, acknowledged, when (*p.* 82.) in ſumming

ming up his Authors, he brings none who ſpeak ſo clearly for him as a Pope. He tells us, that Pope *Nicolas* declared (we acknowledge their *Deſire* and *Intereſt* it ſhould be ſo thought) *Epiſcopatuum Cathedras inſtituit Romana Eccleſia, &c.*

It ſeems, Sir, *Popery* is no friend to the *Jus Divinum* of *Epiſcopacy*. And *p.* 78, Mr. *Cr.* tells us, *That the Pope's Legate interdicted the Diſpute in the Council of* Trent, *concerning the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy; or directed it in ſuch general and uncertain debates, that there might be no determination of it.*

Is *the Pope* ſo much his own *Enemy*; as not to endure *the determination* of that which is his *beſt ſupport?* Doth *the Pope* ſo much dread his *beſt plea*, as not to endure to *hear*, it, or let any *own it?* Sure, they had other thoughts of the *Jus Divinum* of *Epiſcopacy* at *Rome*: which, ſure I am, is as much abhorred there as at *Geneva*.

And

And truly they have Reaſon for it: and they know it. Hence proceeded that *violent Oppoſition* and *fearful Outcryes* againſt that *Tenent*, we read of in Father *Fauls* Hiſtory *of the Councel of Trent*, p. 497. *Lanerius* a Jeſuit tels them, *Meram eſſe contradictionem, Velle Pontificem eſſe caput Eccleſiæ, velle regimen eſſe Monarchicum; & tamen affirmare, Eſſe aliquam Poteſtatem non derivatam ab ipſo, ſed aliunde acceptam.* So that *Biſhops* deriving their *Authority* from *Chriſt*, deſtroyes *his Holineſs* from being *the Spiritual Monarch*: becauſe he is not then, *the fountain* of *all Power*. It ſeems, this Learned *Romaniſt* underſtood very well, that theſe *Tenents*, which paſs at *Lectures* for one and the ſame; are *irreconcileable Contradictions*: and that which is called *Popery* in *England*, quite deſtroyes that which is ſo at *Rome*. This *plain* and *clear Papacy* puls down *the* Pope. And the Reaſons are ſummed up to

our

our hands, by that incomparably judicious Hiſtorian, *Inde enim colligebant Claves non fuiſſe ſoli* Petro *datas, & Concilium eſſe ſupra* Papam: *ſiebantq; Epiſcopi æquales* Pontifici; *cui nihil relinquebatur niſi quædam præ aliis Prærogativa.* Thence would follow, if *Epiſcopal Authority* were by *Divine Right*, immediately derived from *Chriſt*, without dependance on the *See* of *Rome*: It would follow, that *the Keyes* were not only given to St. *Peter*, and conſequently *the diſpoſal* of them not ſolely in his *ſucceſſor*; then *a Councel*, as conſiſting of men whoſe *Authority* was as *immediately divine*, as *his own*, would be above *the* Pope; every *Biſhop* was *the* Popes *equal* as to that, who would then by *Divine Right* have nothing but *a primacy* of *Order*. Theſe are amongſt other *conſequences*, from *the Divine Right* of *Epiſcopacy* once *granted*, as impoſſible to be *avoided*; as unlike to be *approved* at

Rome

Rome. The clearing of this ſhould, in all Reaſon, commend *Epiſcopacy* to thoſe men, who make *oppoſition* to *Rome* the *rule* of their *Faith*. But oh the *intolerable* (though *holy*) *villany* of thoſe *godly Cheats*, who Preached up this Tenent for *Popery*: which all, who underſtand what *Popery* means, know to be *the bane* of it; and was at *Trent*, by the *See* of *Romes* moſt skilful Advancers *diſcarded as ſuch*. It ſeems ſome not eſteemed *Jeſuites* can *lie* for *God*; and *pious frauds* can be *uſed*, and *rayled at*.

It is ſaid by the *Oxf.* men in their *third ground* of their *firſt exception*, That they are not ſatisfyed of that Phraſe in the Covenant [*Leſt we be partakers of other mens ſins*]. They do not apprehend how they are *guilty of thoſe ſins* (ſuppoſe them to be *ſins*, which is not yet proved) unleſs they endeavour by *fire* and *ſword* to root them out. To which Mr. *Cr.* Replyes,

Replyes, p. 76. *That they are so guilty*, but hath not one word to prove it. *That Saints in Scripture did weep for other mens sins, I read:* But that they esteemed them to be made *their own*, if they did not *fight them down*, I do *not read*. There were Kings of *Israel* who were *Idolaters*, and the Law was general, that they who were such should be *put to death*: yet, I do not find the Prophets telling the People, that it was the same thing for them not to *stone the King*, as it was for him to *worship stones*. And yet this is the Import of that expression; *Those are our sins, we are partakers of them, if we do not pull them down:* The Foundation of the second Article of the Covenant, is harder then all the Laws of God besides, (if it self be one). It binds us to *the extirpation of all Superstition, Heresie, Schism, Profaneness, or whatever shall be found contrary to the Power of Godliness*; and this

this they make to be every mans *duty*, and *ſwear* him to it, under no milder expreſſions then theſe; [*Leſt we be partakers of other mens ſins, and ſo in danger to receive their plagues*]. And here, if we conſider *the way* of endeavouring *this Covenant* practiſed and required, *viz. Fire* and *Sword*; and with this their Invitation to *Foraign Churches*, where there are no *Parliaments* with pretence of *ſhare* in *the Government*, ſo that they muſt only be looked upon as ſo many *private men*; on whom yet this *duty* is *incumbent*: It teaches us this by that Engagement, [*Leſt we partakers of other mens ſins*, &c.] That *a godly man can never be at peace with himſelf, till he be at war with every one he knows or thinks wicked. He muſt perpetually expect Gods vengeance on himſelf, when he is not executing it upon another.*

The firſt thing of moment againſt this Article, is *p.* 78. That *the Univerſal*

verſal alleadged Practiſe of 1500 *years will more weaken then ſtrengthen the Divine Right; for, the moſt pure eſtate was before that in the firſt* 140. *years*. I ſhall not at all inſiſt upon the *Catalogues* of *Biſhops*, in unqueſtionable Hiſtories to be had even from the beginning. But only ſay this, That *all Chriſtian Churches* in thoſe dayes ſhould deviate from *the Primitive pattern*, and all *the ſame way*, no *common cauſe* imaginable inducing them to *err the ſame way*, is a thing highly incredible. As to that which is ordinarily urged, *viz. Ambition*, it could not, if we conſider *the Perſons*, or *Times*, have been *univerſal*; nor, if we conſider *the thing*, have been *at all*. Being *a Biſhop*, having only the priviledge of being *burnt* next.

Mr. *Cr.* in the following Pages makes demands for *Texts*. Though the Article inſiſts only on *Practiſe*, and ſo is not concerned. Which if

not granted good, *National*, *Parochial Churches*, *The Canon of the Scripture*, and *the Lords-Day*, are loſt. Nor is this Truth utterly paſt by in Scripture: though if it had, conſidering that the intent was to deliver to us *Doctrine*, not *the preciſe Form* of *Diſcipline*, we might rationally have appealed to *Antiquity* in that Point, *i. e.* to *the Practiſe* of thoſe from whom we receive *the Canon* of *the Scripture*, and without whoſe Suffrage, were it once queſtioned, it were not poſſible without *immediate Revelation* to have it ſufficiently *atteſted* to be what it pretends to be.

Mr. *Cr.* tells us, that *Biſhops* and *Presbyters* are *intruſted* with the ſame *Power* of *Governing*. But I cannot be ſatisfied in this particular: ſince I find *Timothy* and *Titus* being ſingle men, are without any intimation of others being *equal with them*, directed how to *receive accuſations*, and

and to *rebuke* and *censure*. Evidences, in my apprehension, pregnant enough of *sole Jurisdiction*.

To disprove the Universal alleadged Practise, he tells us, *That the King of* Denmark *in the year* 1537. *exstirpated it, and so did the* Scots *since*. Goodly, goodly! And so did those he pleads for, *the long Parliament*. I cannot apprehend but that either he *droles*, or is utterly ignorant of *the nature* of *Tradition*, as taking it to be, what none ever contradicted; a notion of it, which they that understand what it means, have not. Sure I am, at that rate, *the Deity* of *Christ*, cannot approve it self to be *Catholick Doctrine*, because there were *Arians* of old, and are *Socinians* now.

The *mutual correspondence* by *Letters* which was at that time used in *the Church* forbad any *Church* to be *ignorant* of what *all the Churches do hold*; so that *Innovations* could not but be discovered: And to suppose,

that the ſame *Impoſture* ſhould be impoſed upon *all the Churches* together in thoſe early dayes, as an *Apoſtolick Tradition*, upon ſo many various Countries, and Inclinations upon men, whoſe choiſeſt care was in *delivering*, and *dying* for that *Faith* they had *once received* from *the Apoſtles*; is to ſuppoſe all the World to be out of their wits together. If they tell us, It was *the ambition* of Paſtors, that introduced that *Order*; no account can be given how this ſhould be *univerſal*, and yet not *perceived*, or *reſiſted*: and this is as ſtrange as to the Exemplar *Piety* of thoſe *Times*. And yet more, in the nature of the thing it is abſurd: For *their ambition* in that caſe, could tend to nothing but a more quick and ſevere *Martyrdom*, to be ſooner *burnt* then their fellows. The Heathens *ſpite* was at the Biſhops as well as the Presbyterians.

Aerius

Aerius being called *a Heretick*, for promoting that Opinion himſelf glories in, he qualifieth with this; *That* Auſtin *only calleth it* Proprium dogma, *p.* 87. Which term in St. *Auſtin's* eſteem ſignifieth nothing leſs. In his judgement, for *a private man* to oppoſe his own *private Opinion*, dictated by *diſcontent* (as ſome *late ones* are known to have been for not being *Biſhops themſelves*) in a matter of fact againſt all Records, Hiſtories, and the owned Practiſe of all the Churches, was *Spiritual Pride* and *Folly*. And St. *Auſtin* in that caſe, would (if pertinaciouſly held) not at all have ſtickt to have called it *Hereſie*. If the expreſſion he uſeth do not import as much.

In *the Anſwer* to *the fourth Exception* handled (I know not why) before *the third*, I find nothing material, only *p.* 92. in anſwer to that acknowledgement, *That the Holy Church was founded in Prelacy*, be-

cauſe the Church, when that Statute was made, was *Popiſh*, he inſinuates that it was ſo when it was *firſt founded* in *Prelacy*. A thing which the *Romaniſts* have long in vain laboured to prove; and if Mr. *Cr.* will at laſt do it effectually, the *Pope* will (no doubt) acknowledge his *good ſervice* with *many thanks*.

The third of the *Oxf. Reaſons* is now conſidered, Why it was not in its own *turn* conſidered, I know not, unleſs this *Book* was wrote by *a Club*, and he to whoſe *lot* this fell, was not *timely provided*.

The firſt was this, The *Oxf. men* alleadge, *That they had, as they were by Law required, teſtified their approbation to that Government as agreeable to the Word of God, which they are now required to ſwear down as contrary to it.*

To which Mr. *Cr.* (if not, for the above mentioned Reaſon, his fellow-helper) tells us, *The Article might only*

only intend it to be a Political Civil Conſtitution, as indeed all our Statutes do ſuggeſt, and ſo an adiaphoron, &c. *p.* 94.

This is the beſt *Salvo* to reconcile this *Oath* with *the Subſcription*, and this Mr. *Cr.* himſelf refutes, *p.* 95. By telling us, That in the Book *Ordering Prieſts*, &c. It is directly affirmed, That *it is evident by the Holy Scriptures*, &c. That *from the Apoſtles, Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons*, &c. Which words declare their intent to found that *Government* upon *the Word* of *God*, not *the Law* of *the Land*; and ſo that *Interpretation* of his is falſe: and the *Oxf. mens Reaſon* good, and *the Covenant* irreconcileable with *the Subſcription*.

The *Oxf. mens* ſecond Reaſon is, *They had received Orders from Biſhops Hands, and therefore could not ſo ill requite them, as to lay to their hands to pull them down.* To which Mr. *Cr.* Replyes, *p.* 96. *In ſo doing, they would do the Biſhops a real kindneſs,*

of which he gives us this ſatisfactory account. Richard Havering *Archbiſhop of* Dublin, *dreamt that a Monſter heavier then the whole world ſtood upon him, and when he waked, thought it to be his Biſhoprick, and renounced it.* Sure Mr. *Cr.* was *ſcarſe awake*, when he thought to *anſwer* the Univerſity with *a dream.*

The fourth Reaſon is this, *They held their livelyhoods by ſuch Titles*, &c. And, ſure, being not convict of any crime, were not to be bound to undo themſelves, and were to the contrary ſworn. *Cr. p. 97. They held their Eſtates at the pleaſure of the Parliament, whoſe Pow r is over the enjoyment of all publick (much more particular) Societies, againſt whoſe Laws, no Domeſtick Laws, or Oaths could bind them.*

We have already ſhewed how *this Covenant* deſtroyes *the Kings Prerogative:* this Doctrine teaches us in what a high degree it aſſerts *the Proprieties* and *Liberties* of *the Subject.*

The

The Power of *Parliaments* over our *Eſtates*, ſo as to diſpoſe of ſome part in *Taxes* according to our ſeveral Proportions, is indeed clear and legal. (To prevent wilful miſtakes, I do not mean to juſtifie the *Taxes* the *Long Parliament* impoſed. For they may diſpoſe of *the Subjects money* to *the King*: They have no pretence of *right* to diſpoſe of it to *themſelves*). But this *Power* of *Parliaments* which Mr. *Cr*, pleads for, is equally groundleſs and unreaſonable: *a power* ſo unlimited both in regard to their *King* and *Countrey*; as it is not fit in regard of either they ſhould have, nor doth it at all appear how, or when, they came to have it. It can never be made appear to be *one* of the *due priviledges* of *Parliaments*: unleſs we ſuppoſe, whatever it is poſſible for them to *Vote*, to be *ſo*, though againſt all *the Laws* and *the King*; and then what a prety Animal is his *Majeſty* of *England*.

But

But in earneſt, if it be conſidered by any, but thoſe who no otherwiſe are like to *get Eſtates*; or can *juſtifie* what they have *already got*; That *the two Houſes* may diſpoſe at *pleaſure* of all *the Lands* of *publick* and *particular Societies* (and ſure, then *private mens*; for ſo, beſide that other capacity, are thoſe who are *intereſſed* in *Publick Lands*) though *convict* of no *crime*; That they may *cancel* all *Oaths*: is, what I never till now thought to be, *one* of *the Liberties* of *the Kingdom*. If their *Power* and *Truſt* be ſo great, I would we had not at leaſt, *the ſecurity* of an *Oath*, that they would uſe it well. By this Doctrine, they may even *ſtrike up a bargain*, and *ſhare* all amongſt themſelves. And, call you this *Securing Propriety?*

A Monarchy may poſſibly be founded in *Nature*, and ſo in *himſelf* retain all *rights* he hath not parted with. But ſuch a thing as an *Aſſembly*,

bly, as our *Parliaments*, can have no pretence to any thing (as I before have obſerved) but what they have *by Grant* from him who calls them, or compact with thoſe who ſend them. Whatever therefore they cannot thus *ſhew*, they are not to *pretend to*; for *Aſſemblies* are not *born*, but *made*.

As to *Lands* that the *two Houſes* have any thing to do, further then by *Eſtabliſhed Laws* they are enabled, which receive *all force* from *the Kings aſſent*; I cannot imagine ground for.

Our *Lands* we all *receive* from, and *hold* of, *the KING*; as Sir *Edward Cook* in the firſt part of his *Inſtit.* and, as I remember, in the very beginning: but that we at all *depend* upon *the two Houſes* for them; He (though a great *adorer* of that *Aſſembly*) affirmeth not. But if we had *received them* partly from *the two Houſes*, (of which there is not the

the leaſt *ſhadow* or *colour*,) yet that would not *juſtifie* this Doctrine, *They may diſpoſe of them at pleaſure*; as Mr. *Cr.* prodigiouſly affirms to the *Oxf.* men, who alleadge, That they were not *convict* of *any crime*, becauſe they had not *broke* the *conditions* upon which they *received them*. Did *they*, at the ſame time, *give them*, and *keep them*, at their *own diſpoſe*? And upon this ground it is, that *His Majeſty* could not, without *injuſtice*, and conſequently without *ſin*, ſhould He have agreed to *the Houſes* in that particular; (though in *the Courts* of *Earth*, it might have had *the effect* of *a Law*; yet in that of *Heaven*, it would have *paſſed* for *Iniquity* eſtabliſhed by *a Law*:) becauſe by giving it to another, he paſſed away that *intereſt* from himſelf, when he gave it away. The *Dominium utile* I meau, and in this, I think, conſiſts *the propriety* of *the Subject*. But Mr. *Cr.* hath placed this *All-diſpoſing Power*,

Power in *the two Houſes*, when they were *in hoſtile oppoſition* to *the King*: and ſo makes us as *great Slaves*, as Earth hath any; to our *fellow-Subjects*. And much greater *ſlaves* are all we *free-born People* of *England*, made by *the aſſertors* of our *Liberties*; then *Villains* were among our ſelves. For I remember, though not *the page*, and have not *the book* by me, that Sir *Edw. Cook* in his Chap. of *Villenage*, affirmes, *That whatever the ſlave had, was his Lords; yet if the Villain paſſed any thing to another before the Lord ſeized or claim'd it, ſuch a paſſage was valid: and if the Lord himſelf had made the Villain any fixed Eſtate, he was ſo far from retaining any power over it, that it enfranchiſed his Villain.* In both theſe *caſes*, we are worſe then *Villains*, though never ſo much *free-born*. For after the *firſt owner*, i. e. *their founders*, hath paſſed *the Land* away, (as in the *Oxf.* mens *caſe*) *the Houſes*

Power

Power remains as good as ever: which *the Lords* of *the Villains* did not. And in *the ſecond*, let our *Eſtate* be never ſo *fixed*, it is, as Mr. *Cr.* aſſures us, *p.* 97. but *at the pleaſure of the Parliament*; and by that too, he means, *the two Houſes*. And this is *ſecuring Propriety*: but ſo they *ſecured the King* at *Holmby*, and the *Iſle of Wight*. Certainly, this *Scottiſh Doctrine* would never have been *pleaded for* by any, but thoſe whom *the two Houſes* had aſſured, they ſhould have *a conſiderable ſhare* in the *next ſcamble*. But I marvel the People ſhould like *this Doctrine*; they have (ſure I am) no Reaſon, but becauſe it is called *Securing Propriety*. And thus it is true of us, what *Charls* the Fifth, is ſaid, by *Strada*, to report of the *Dutchmen*, *Nullos eſſe populos qui ſervitutis nomen magis execrentur magis, patiantur*. We cannot endure to be called, *Slaves*, *ſlaves*; but will earneſtly *contend* to be

be ſo. And truly, the *effect* would have been *the ſame* in *both*, had our *Noble Patriots* been uninterrupted *Victors*; who fought againſt *Taxes*, till we came to *pay* the greateſt in all the World.

All this which hath been hitherto urged in this Point, hath been in their *behalf* only as men which equally concerns *all the Nation*. There is ſomething yet for them, in that capacity, to be urged, which is peculiar to it. How? If beſides *the intereſt* the *Oxf.* men had in them as theirs; *God* had *an intereſt* in them as His. Sure I am, if God doth accept of *any thing* from men under *the Goſpel*: He hath ſuch *an intereſt* in thoſe *Lands*; becauſe they were *granted* to *God*, by *King* and *Parliament*; and when they were in *a National capacity*, and ſo according to Mr. *Cr.* Divinity, *p.* 145. *That obligation not to divert them to other uſes, lies upon us while we are a Nation.*

tion. By that National Act; each man is barred, even those who are not by a Personal. This is Mr. *Cr.* own *Divinity* throughout his whole *Sixth Section*; particularly in *p.* 145, 146, &c. The *Covenant* swears *us* to *that* we were before *obliged* not to do. That that was one *alteration* Christ brought into the World; That God would henceforth *accept* of *no fixed Estate* in any thing from men, to the *use* of those who were *employed* in *the Sacred Function*: is a part of the *Gospel* not at all *revealed* in *Scripture.* That whatever is *given* to the *Church*, is *forfeited* to *the State*, (though given before *the Civil Law* had *prohibited* it;) is a strange *Statute* of *Mortmain.* The Money *Ananias* his *Lands* were sold for, God is said (*Acts* 5.) *to have an Interest in*: Would He not have had *an Interest* in *the Land too*, had it not been *sold?* This is a very *strange Evasion*; but only men must say *something.*

When

When the only reaſon why God had *an Intereſt* in the *mony*, was, becauſe it was *the price of his own Land*. Whence can *my title* come to *the mony*, for which *ſuch Land* was *ſold*, *eo nomine*, as *the Price of it*, if I have *no intereſt* in that *Land*? That becauſe *God* doth not *command* our *Lands*, therefore he will not *accept them*; the ſo much derided *Oxford Caſuiſts* know to be a pitiful lame *conſequence*. The *Supreme Authority*, where ever reſiding, is every where the ſame *equally abſolute*. Suppoſe, had *the Supreme Authority* diſpoſed of *Ananias* his Money; had they not in that Caſe *robbed God*? Sure then, by the very ſame Reaſon, our *Parliaments* may do ſo too. If you ſay, The *caſe* is *different*; (our Magiſtrates are *Chriſtians*, theirs not:) this is not to the purpoſe. For *Civil Authority* is not founded in *the truth* of our *Religion*. And 'tis a prety nicety, That it is a *great ſin* for any to *rob God*, but

those who *believe* him to be *a God*. This were a most admirable *plea* for a Rebel; who *owned him* whom he *fought against*, to be his *lawful Prince*. If I should urge examples out of the *Old Testament*; the answer is ready: Whatever is there to be found, if men have not *a mind* to it, *is part of the Ceremonial Law abolisht at the coming of Christ*. Though why any thing should be counted *part* of that *Law*, which *Moses* doth not set down *as such*; nor I, nor they, can give any *tolerable account*. They must, to begin, say, *Moses his description is imperfect*. But that this is one of the differences of *the Priesthood* of *the Law*, and *the Ministery* of *the Gospel*; that in the *Lands* of the former God had *an Interest*, and not in those of the latter: is, I think, not from Scripture to be *found*. What I cite out of the *Jewish* story in this matter, is answered; They were *Jews*: what out of other stories,

ries; They were *Heathens*. If I ſhould cite the example of the *Patriarch* under *the Law* of *Nature*, and ſhew them to have alwayes eſteemed God *intereſted* in *ſuch Lands*: Then their anſwer is, themſelves know not well what; but at laſt, all the *Patriarchs actions*, were *Figures of things to come*, the *body is Chriſt*. And that, as the reſt, was *Typical*. If I aske, *Typical of what?* I muſt be fain to tell them my ſelf; *Prieſts* all along being capable of *Land* in *Gods Right* before *the Goſpel*, was *Typical* of this, That thoſe under *the Goſpel* ſhould not be ſo *capable*. Believe it, a moſt ſpecial and proper *Type* it is. If *God* hath *an intereſt* in thoſe *Lands*, I hope the *Parliaments juriſdiction*, (though very much improved of late) is not *over Him too*. I verily perſwade my ſelf, had the *Committee of Safety* pulled down *Tithes*; ſome men would have found ſuch *a ſin* as *Sacriledge* to be poſſible

to be *committed* in the times of *the Goſpel*, though there be no *command* in *the Goſpel* for them.

But after all this, there is a *material thing* in this *Exception*, not taken notice of by Mr. *Cr.* which is, *The Iniquity* of *this Article*, in obliging the *Oxf.* men to *pull down* thoſe, by whoſe *titles* many of them hold their *lively-hoods*; *i. e.* to *bind* them, (even before they are *convicted* of any *crime*) to *undo* themſelves. The wildly large *power* of *Parliaments* alledged, is not large enough to reach this. For, though they have *power* to diſpoſe of *my Eſtate* at *pleaſure*; yet, to *bind* me ſincerely, to the utmoſt of *my power*, to endevour to *aſſiſt them* in *ruining my ſelf*, is a thing far different. Where there is *a juſt Power*, and *deſerved ſentence* (both which were in this caſe wanting) though I may be *obliged* to *ſubmit*; yet ſure, not *ſincerely* and to *the utmoſt* of *my*

power

Power to endevour to have it executed upon me.

In the 101 *page*, He conſiders that *Argument* uſed in behalf of *Epiſcopal Government*, viz. *The agreeableneſs* of it to the *civil conſtitution* of the *Kingdom*, which he proves to be *no Argument* by *two Mediums*. The firſt is, *Chriſts Kingdom is not of this world*, Ergo. The ſecond is this, *Chriſt hath a Regal Power, and is faithful in the Adminiſtration of his houſe*: ergo, *The agreement of a Church Government to the Civil conſtitution of the State, is no Argument for ſuch a Church Government.*

As to the later *Argument*, I ſhall not anſwer it at all; but deſire the Reader to conſult the place, that he may ſee that *the Argument* is his *own*: and then ask him, Whether *in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*; ergo, *The agree-*

ableneſs of, &c. were not altogether as concluſive.

As to the former, though a ſlighted *Argument*, I ſay it is a *material one*: and it is none of the leaſt commendations of *Chriſtian Religion*, that it provides even for the *temporal ſecurity of men* and *ſtates*; and, were they obeyed univerſally, we ſhould have a kind of *heaven* before we came thither. But had Mr. *Cr.* but read over the whole verſe, he argues from, and but conſidered the occaſion of its being delivered; he would ſure not have uſed it in *this Argument*. He could not have avoided *a Doctrine*, which ſets a clear diſtinction between *the Church* of *Chriſt*, and that of *Scotland*; it is this, *My Kingdom is not of this World, elſe would my ſervants fight*: i. e. *His Kingdom* which was not of *this world*, was not to be *promoted* by *the way* of *this World*. That *Cauſe* which refuſed *the aſſiſtance* of *Legions of Angels*, ſcorned

ſcorned *the aid* of *Armies of Rebels.*

Againſt *Biſhops ſuperiority* over *Presbyters*, and their *medling* in *Temporal Affairs*, there is a Prohibition brought out of Scripture, *The Princes of the Gentiles exerciſe Dominion*, &c. *But it ſhall not be ſo among you; but whoever will be great among you, let him be your Miniſter; and whoever will be Chief among you, let him be your Servant*, Matth. 20. 25, 26, 27. Mark. 10. 42, 43, 44. Luk. 22. 23, 24.

The Impertinency of this place is clear at firſt ſight. For it *proves* nothing of this *nature*, or too much: concludes not *againſt us*, unleſs *againſt them too*: For it concludes for an *abſolute equality*, if any thing in this Point; and ſo *Super-Intendents* are as bad as *Biſhops*, and *the ſin* of *Temporary Moderators* is coeval to *their Office*. The only difference which is to be between *all Chriſtians*, e-

ſpecially *Clergy-men*, (if the ſenſe of the words be this alleadged) is, *Who ſhall be moſt humble*. But ſure, *Chriſts Precept* and *Practice*, did not ſo much *differ*: *The Twelve* and *the Seventy* were, ſure, *not equal*. *Timothy* and *Titus* were *Superiors* to thoſe whom they were to *rebuke*, to *judge*. The *Angel* of each *Church* in this *Revelation* had *ſome authority*, ſure, over thoſe he was *threatned* for not inflicting *Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures* upon. If this be the Import of the place, there is no manner of *Authority* in one *Church-man* over another, (if there be of any Chriſtian over another); ſo that every *Synod* may be reproved with, *Ye take too much upon you*, &c. if one ſingle *Presbyter* diſſent, and they *puniſh him*. But the truth is, Theſe words do rather teach *Superiors* how to *behave themſelves*, then *deny* any to be ſo; and ſuppoſe, rather than forbid, ſome to be *greater* and *more chief* then others:

others: *He who is great*, &c. *He who is chief.*

By the uſual Application of this Miſtake, it is alſo concluded (I ſuppoſe) from the firſt words, *The Princes*, &c. *exerciſe Dominion*, &c. *But it ſhall not be ſo among you*, &c.) unlawful for *Clergy-men* to be endowed with any *Civil Authority*; and Mr. *Cr. p.* 101. hath ſtated the Queſtion, *What will become of the Biſhops, when the Dukes be damned?*

That *Clergy-men* may not *meddle* with *Temporal Affairs*, (if a truth) is ſuch a one, which, *the Preſbyterian Miniſters* are the moſt *unfit people* in the world to *plead for*: of whoſe *guilt* in this particular, *theſe Nations*, and almoſt *all Europe*, are *publick* and *bloudy Teſtimonies*. Nor did they procure *the leaſt ſhare* they have had by *the pretence* of *having none*, and diſclaiming to *have any*. Here I might be copious, but to omit others, I ſhall peculiarly ſtick to the buſineſs

in

in hand, and only intimate *the ſelf-condemnation* they brought upon *themſelves*, in relation to this *Tenent*, and the *Oxf. men*. To be *Head* of *a Colledge*, is certainly *a Civil Authority*: and this, ſure, they did not *refuſe*; but *contend for* with *War*, *fraud*, and *violence*. Did they not very *godlily Viſit themſelves* into what *a godly Miniſter* dares not be, as being uncapable? To be *a Vice-Chancellour* as ſo, and in that *right* to be *a Juſtice of Peace*, are *Authorities*, (I think) not *purely ſpiritual*. And to be *a School-Maſter* is ſo too. And to take the other Argument uſed in this caſe; *The Miniſtery requires the whole man*: this takes up more time from *his Function Miniſterial* than to be *a Peer of the Realm*. And this laſt inſtance brings in another, *To be Maſter of a Family* is *a Civil Authority*; *Correction*, there not *purely ſpiritual*.

But

But the truth, though urged in behalf of both these *Presbyterian Tenents*, signifies *nor of*, *nor on*, to either. They are an *Answer* to a *Question*; they are the deciding (or rather taking away the Foundation of) *a Controversie*. We shall therefore endeavour to attain their true meaning, by that sure and easie and neglected Method; considering the *occasion* upon which those words were delivered. For it is not *citing*, but *profaning* Scripture, to urge it as *a proof* of what it was never intended to *concern*: But such shifts those men are unavoidably brought to, who first *resolve* upon *Conclusions* and *Practices*, and then are necessitated to *seek Principles* to make *them good*; those men must make *the best* of such as they *can get*.

The *Occasion* of those words must needs be the same with *the Quarrel* he thereby *appeased*: unless we will suppose our *Saviour* to have spoke

ſpoke *beſides the buſineſs* He ſpoke to; and *the Diſciples* ſatisfied with *nothing* to the *purpoſe:* which *Diſputes* about being *made great*, ſeldom are. Which was this; The *Jews* had an Opinion of *the Meſſias* as of *a temporal Prince*; and *the Diſciples* were not free from that *Error:* and in this ſenſe it was, they thought he ſhould *reſtore the Kingdom to Iſrael.* Upon this account, they thought their *Religion* entituled them to *Secular Grandure*, & were *ſharing the great Offices.* And that this was it *Chriſt reproved*, and that this was the very miſtake; is as often evident, as there are diſcourſes of theirs about *Chriſts Kingdom:* The not thorough purging out of which Tenent, was the cauſe, that *one branch* of it occaſioned the *Millenarian Error* in *the firſt Ages.* Chriſt had indeed promiſed them *they ſhould raign with Him in his Kingdom:* But let them not nouriſh *carnal pride*, for *His Kingdom* was not to be *here.*

All

All which can be gathered from hence, is, That *Christians, as such, cannot claim Secular Honors: or, if they have them, they are not by reason of them to be Supercilious toward, but more useful to, those who want them; not to scorn, but to help their Brethren.* This doth not at all prove, That if *the Civil Magistrate*, at whose disposal *Honours* are, will *dignifie Clergy-men*, they may not *accept it*; when it may be *the concernment* and *the welfare* of *Church* and *State:* which are no such *Enemies* as that they cannot be administred to by the same Persons. I wonder, how so much is so securely built on this Text, when it cannot be made out, that *Christ* spake these words to *the Apostles* as in the capacity of *Clergy-men*. That *Clergy-men*, either as so, or as *Christians*, have not an *eternal Right* to *Secular Honours*, I grant. Christ *bequeathed* no such *thing:* but that He any where made *them uncapable*,

if

if *the Civil Magiſtrate* (who is *the Fountain of Honour*,) beſtows any upon them, I no where read. He left thoſe things as he found them: to be *beſtowed* as he whoſe *right* it was to *diſpoſe* of them ſhould *ſee cauſe*. Chriſt would, certainly, have ſharply and plainly *reprehended* ſuch an *Univerſal Cuſtom*, had he intended to remove it. But ſeeing He and his Apoſtles ſaid nothing *againſt it*, they certainly intended it to *remain* as before.

The Exception to the third Article, is, That there is *a limitation* put upon an *abſolute duty*. [*To defend the Kings Perſon and Authority, in the preſervation of the true Religion, and Liberties of the Kingdom*]. Though *the King* is really *bound* to thoſe things: yet *his neglect* of *his duty*, doth not *diſcharge us of ours*. To this Mr. *Cr.* replyes, *Thoſe words are not a limitation of duty; but a predication of the capacity the Parliament*

and

and People were in, and ſo the meaning is; We being in the preſervation of the true Religion and Liberties of the Kingdom, ſhall endeavour to preſerve the King, &c. An *Interpretation* not to be made good by *Grammar*: To which (I muſt needs confeſs this though) it may as eaſily be recouciled, as to their Actions. All *Declarations* and *Sermons* were but *Satyrs* againſt *the King*; they repreſented Him equally an *Enemy* to *God* and *Man*, *Religion* and *Liberty*; upon which ſcore, they juſtified *Violences*, as great as they would have his *Crimes* thought. In ſhort, they had this pretence, to deprive him of *all power*, and that he was not fit to be *truſted with any*. Let any man but ask himſelf, what *caſe* the King was in, what *uſage* he had, or might *expect* in thoſe *dayes*; he would readily grant this Interpretation of Mr. *Cr.* (which is indeed as far from *the ſenſe* of *their words*, as *truth* of *their actions*)

actions) to shew them to be as *Loyal*, as he should be thought by Mr. *Cr. friendly*; who should *revile* and *persecute* him all wayes imaginable for *Non-conformity*; and then should thus manifest to all the world *his tenderness* to him, should engage *multitudes* of his powerful and enraged *Enemies*, in *a Covenant* to defend Mr. *Cr.* in defence of the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* of *the Church* of *England*. A *Parenthesis* would be in Mr. *Cr.* Eye, a slender ground of our *good will* toward him. This is not only the natural and practised meaning of that *phrase*, but the confessed and owned one, Mr. *Cr. Legislators*, *the Commons*, in Answer to the *Scotch Commissioners* 28. *November* 1646. *p.* 21. acknowledge and plead for this sense of those dangerous words, [*They are to preserve the King*, &c. *Relatively*, viz. *In the preservation of*, &c.] And frequently in that Declaration, blame *the Scots*, for mentioning

tioning *the Preſervation of the King*, and omitting that clauſe upon which they were bound to *defend him*. This being then the natural and confeſſed meaning of thoſe words, and, in Mr. *Cr.* own jugdement, *ſinful*, *p.* 103. Becauſe, as he truly there urges, *Allegiance, and ſo the preſerving the Kings Perſon and Authority, is an abſolute duty founded in the Relation, without regard to the Quality, Piety or Impiety of the Perſon*, &c. *And this is a duty we are bound to God to perform.* If there were no more againſt *the Covenant* then this, Mr. *Cr.* muſt acknowledge *the Covenant* to be as to *the matter, unlawful*; and ſo in his own eſteem obliging to nothing but *Repentance*: becauſe it endeavours to *bind* us to to what he owns to be *ſin*. But if this which Mr. *Cr.* is aſhamed to own, (either becauſe he takes it not to be *true*, or elſe not *ſeaſonable*) be not the true meaning of thoſe

words, and *the King* for *misusing his Authority* is not to be *deprived*; nay, even then they *swear* to *preserve* it. I will not say, What meant that *Resolve* pleaded in the aforesaid *Answer* to the *Scots*, p. 65. *That until satisfaction and security be given to both Kingdoms, the King was not to be admitted to come to them with Honor, Freedom, and Safety.* If to *dispose* of every thing in the Nation *without*, and *against his command*, be to *preserve his Authority*, I wish They had been so *preserved*. What mean the Votes of *Non-Address*, 1647. (Recalled, I confess; but let us consider, it was when *Affairs* were so much *changed*, that *the Army* was ready to give them the same *Law* they had given *the King*, to *defend* them just so:) Nay, I shall go on; What means *the Loyalty* they so much brag of now, *The Isle* of *Wight Treaty*? *All Offices*, *Civil Military*, *Peers*, *Counsellours*, *Judges*, *Marriage* of his

own *Children*; in effect, all the *Regalia*: Call you this *preſerving his Authority?* Thoſe horrid words are in themſelves clear: and, if they had not been ſo, their *Opinions* had made them ſo.

In the concluſion of this third Article, *p.* 104. After the ſuppoſed Jeer of *ſerious Caſuiſts*; he tells us, *They muſt grant, that where the words of an Oath ſeemingly doubtful may, they muſt be taken in a good ſenſe.* The *Oxf.* men were in this caſe of another mind; where an *Oath* is ſo *doubtful*, I am rather to *refuſe*, for fear it ſhould engage me upon *a ſin*, and ſo I might be engaged to *diſhonour God* for his *own ſake*. An *Oath* is to be taken in the *ſenſe* of him that *gives* it; otherwiſe it is no *ſecurity*, but *a cheat*. Shall I then *ſtrain a ſenſe* upon an *Oath* which the words *offer not*, (not to ſay, *will not admit*), and *the Authors*, I am ſure, *purſue not*.

To the fourth Article, The Exception is, It will *protect Impiety*, and *necessitate Barbarism*; it layes *a necessity* on the Son to *accuse* his Father, *&c.* and makes way for those who are *sick* of *their Fathers*, &c.

To which the Reply is, *p.* 104. *All penal Statutes for Felony, Treason, The Oath of Allegiance, Supremacy, the Protestation, the Law* Deuteronomy, 13. 6. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. *do the same.* As to the Law of the Land; it looks upon *the harbour Criminals* receive from *near Relations* in some cases, as *duty:* which it would severely and might justly *punish* in others not so *related*, as *a crime.* But not to stand on that, at the very first reading, this Article suggests a considerable difference, from all the above-mentioned Instances. In those I am only obliged to discover *present guilt*, and *endeavours*; which if not *prevented*, may go on to the *high dishonour* of *God*, and *distur-*

disturbance of *the Publick*. *Considerations* if *sincere*, much above any *private*, or *particular Obligements*. But this *Covenant* obliges to discover *all who have been Malignants*; no *consideration* that *the design* is *prevented*, or *repented of*: and therefore serves not at all for *Publick Security*; but may, for *private Ambition*, or *Revenge*.

There is another Exception, which though Mr. *Cr.* pleases to slight, I will be bold to say, all the Earth cannot answer it, *viz.* That it *betrays* inevitably, *The Liberty of the Subject*. We there swear to maintain in setting up an *Arbitrary Power*, when all the Rule they are to go by, is, [*As they think convenient*] which Mr. *Cr.* answers by saying nothing to it. He repeats indeed the other words, [*As the Supream Judicatories, or others from them*, &c.] But saith not one word in answer to that expression, wherein the malignity lies, [*As they*

ſhall judge convenient]. *Words* fit only for thoſe men to *uſe*, who knew they had no *Law* on *their ſide*. It might here (not unſeaſonably) be asked, Who are *the Supream Judicatories?* Certainly, *the two Houſes* diſtinct from *the King*, are ſo far from being *the Supream*, that they are no *Court* at all; nor is there in *Law* any *ſtyle* or *form* of their *joynt Acts*.

To the fifth Article, 't is ſaid firſt, That there is a falſe Aſſertion, *Theſe Kingdoms* (if *Ireland* be one, as in the former Parliaments it is) *are not at Peace*, nor dare the men of *Oxf.* abuſively *thank God* for *a bleſſing* they do not all *believe*, and Mr. *Gr.* proves by no better Argument, then that *England* & *Scotland* entered in *Covenant*. As to *the Peace* which was between *England* and *Scotland*, made by both *Parliaments*, I ask, *If the Power* of *War* and *Peace* be not ſolely *the Kings?* If ſo, here

is

is another of *the Kings Prerogatives*, this *Covenant* preſerved.

As to the ſecond *Remora*, Mr. *Cr.* asks where *this Covenant is defective towards the Kings Rights* &c? I might rather ask, where it is not; where it left him *the Authority* (I do not ſay *Name*, but *Power*) of *a King*, or *the freedom* of *a Gentleman*?

The very deſign of all their Proceedings, which *this Covenant* was a main Engine to effect, was perfect *dethroning him*, when they made what *the Law*, what *their Wit*, the foundation of all *their Power*: called, but *his Counſel, his Controllers*. And this is a Truth ſo clear, that they durſt not for ſhame but call themſelves *his Subjects*; even when they *exerciſed all* but *the Name* of *his Soveraign*. When they *raiſed Armies* to *compel*; even then they made a reſemblance of *their duty* by ſending *Petitions* to *beſeech*. They could not be *Rebels*, but in the ſtyle of

Your Majesties Humble and Loyal Subjects assembled in Parliament. Let Mr. *Cr.* shew me any thing that Law or Reason call *a Right*, or *Prerogative* of *the King*; and I shall quickly make it appear, how they took it from *the King*: and Mr. *Cr.* himself, *p.* 98. hath proved the truth of the Maxime he so much rails at, *No Bishop, no King*, by giving us just such *a King* as he hath allowed us *Bishops*. To *the Bishops* he will allow *the formality* of *the Chair*; and *the KING*, for ought I perceive, shall have no more. *The Lords and Commons* (Methodi & Majestatis causa) *apply themselves to him.* Well said! though I would the Law had been cited for it. *The King*, poor Gentleman, may *sit uppermost*, whilest he is *mannerly*: his *assent* shall be *asked* if he will first *secure us*, he will never *refuse*: If he doth, he shall then be reminded where *the Reason* of *the Kingdom*, nay and *King too*, *resides*.

reſides. As in *the Declaration* about *Hull*, in 1642. *p.* 36.

I am ſo far reconciled to this *abſolute depriving the King* of *his Authority*, that I like it much better than the prety knack of *ſharing* it between *him* and *two equal Houſes*, which would be the worſt Government in the world. It is in our Saviours judgment, *Hard to ſerve two Maſters.* But this Nation ſhould have *ſerved three co-ordinate Enemies*; whoſe *Intereſts*, and conſequently *commands* were *thwarting.* Every *Convention* would be *a wraſtling match*, where each his *buſineſs* was to give another *a fall.*

The *Contradictions* the *Oxf.* men aſſign, are ſo clear, as nothing more; I ſhall therefore ſay little to them, becauſe they beſt appear, when they are nakedly conſidered. One *Ambiguity* I ſhall pitch upon, becauſe it is the moſt conſiderable part of *this Myſtery of Iniquity.*

The

The *Oxf.* men demand [*Which be the beſt Reformed Churches?*] Becauſe before they ſwear to make thoſe *Churches* their *pattern*, it were well, certainly, that they knew them. To which Mr. *Cr. p.* 129. *The Covenant aſſerts not which are the beſt reformed Churches; but binds the Covenanter to the obſervation of whatever ſhall appear, and be found the beſt reformed, as the example to which he ſhall endeavour* England *may be conformed.* Very well Sir, *The Covenant aſſerts not which is the beſt reformed Church,* but *binds* me to reduce *England*, to what ſhall *appear the beſt reformed Church.* That poſſibly may appear to me either that *already eſtabliſhed* in *Old England*, or that *deviſed* for *New England.* Poſſibly I may not find *Claſſes*, or other *canting knacks* in *the Word of God*; and then tell you in your own language, I dare not *own* that for *the Scepter of Chriſt:* which I believe, nay can prove, to be

an

an *Humane Inſtitution*. I can tell where and when it came firſt up: and that *Policy* was the very beſt, (and if any was, that was, the only *juſtifiable*) *Ingredient* in all its *conſtitution*. How ſhall I then *reform England* according to *the Word* of *God*, and *the beſt reformed Churches*; and yet according to the *Scotch mode*, which I know to be neither? Or if I am not bound to the *Scottiſh pattern*; How ſhall I bring the three Kingdoms to *Uniformity*, not only in *Confeſſion* of *Faith*, but *Form* of *Church-Government*, *Directory* for *Worſhip* and *Catechizing*; and how preſerve that in *Scotland*, which I ſwear to do, and yet ſet up another in *England*, which in that caſe I am ſworn to alſo?

But becauſe Mr. *Cr.* tells us, *p.* 129. *The Covenant hath not determined which is the beſt reformed Church*, &c. I would fain know, whether theſe three terms we are

equally

equally ſworn to, [*The Word of God, the beſt Reformed Churches, Uniformity with* Scotland] are three expreſſions of *the ſame Rule*, or of *different ones*. If of *the ſame*; then it is not true, what Mr. *Croſton* being put to his ſhifts, ſayes, becauſe it is expreſly determined, *viz. Scotland*. If of *different*; With what Conſcience can we *ſwear to all*, when by keeping our *Oath* to any *one*, we do neceſſarily break that part of it which was taken to *another?* and in all probability, obſerving in it any *one*, is *breaking* it to both *the other? The Covenant* obligeth us to *reform England* according to *the beſt Reformed Church*, but determines not which it is, as Mr. *Cr.* acknowledges. The reaſon of which is clear; becauſe by that *reſervedneſs*, they *engaged all Sects* to them, when, by declaring their meaning, they had *engaged but one*: every *one* by this means; who was for *the Covenant*, *the Covenant* was for him,

him; and ſuch ambiguity ſure is not an *Oath*, but *a Juggle*. But from this proceeds another Ambiguity, *Who are the common Enemies?* &c. How ſhall I know, who are *Enemies to the beſt Reformed Church*, if I know not *which is ſo?* Can I proſecute any as an *Enemy* to *the beſt reformed* as *ſuch*, and know it *not?* or, ſhall I tell him, I know him to be an *Enemy* to I know *not what?* Mr. *Cr. p.* 128. waves this Plea, and aſſures us, That *the words plainly run to the Church of* Scotland, *&c. and Independents by their enmity to the Church of* Scotland *are our common Enemies.*

This Explication I muſt needs ſay, fits *the meaning* of *the Covenanters*, and the *no meaning* of *the Covenant*. In different Pages, it is as in different States of Affairs: one while *the beſt Reformed Church* is not determined; another while it is plainly *Scotland*. If *Independents* were *common Enemies*, ſure it was from *the Presbyterians*,

rians they received *Arms* and *Authority*. There is a *Contradiction* alledged by the *Oxf.* men, which I thought not to have considered, which because Mr. *Cr.* professes not to *see*, I shall shew it him out of himself. It is,

We are bound *absolutely*, and without *exception* to *preserve*, and yet, upon *supposition*, to *extirpate* the present *Religion* in *the Church* of *Scotland*. To which Mr. *Cr. p.* 131. *That supposition must be plainly expressed in the Covenant to make it a contradictory Oath, which is not done.*

The best way of proving *a Contradiction*, is, to lay the *Propositions* contended so to be, together; which will clearly (if they are so) shew themselves.

Thus then,

We are absolutely bound to preserve the Doctrine and Discipline, &c. *of* Scotland.

We are to bring the three Kingdoms

doms (of which Scotland *is one) to Uniformity in Doctrine and Diſcipline.*

We are to reform 2. England *and* Ireland *according to the beſt Reformed Church.* See the firſt Article of the Covenant.

The Covenant aſſerts not which are the beſt Reformed Churches; but binds the Covenanters to reform England *whatever ſhall appear to be the beſt Reformed Church.* Cr. p. 129.

Thus then,

The firſt Propoſition binds us to *preſerve the Doctrine* and *Diſcipline* of *Scotland* abſolutely. The ſecond to bring the *Engliſh Church*, and the *Scottiſh Church*, to an *Uniformity* in *Doctrine* and *Diſcipline*. The third to *reform England* according to *the beſt Reformed Church*. The fourth aſſures us, that *the Covenant* aſſerts not *Scotland* to be *the beſt Reformed Church*; but binds to *reform England*

England according to whatever ſhall *appear* to be ſo. Now then, if *Scotland* doth not *appear* to be *the beſt Reformed Church*; the third Propoſition binds me to *alter* what the firſt binds me abſolutely to *maintain*. If I am obliged to make *the ſame thing exactly* after *ſeveral Patterns*; if they happen not to be *exactly the ſame*, I muſt neceſſarily, in following *one*, differ ſo much from the *other*, as I follow that which *differs*; for to *agree* with what *differs*, is ſure ſo far to *differ*.

I perceive *the Covenant* is, as it was at firſt, urged to *ſeveral men*, ſo as to comply with their *ſeveral humors*, and *intereſts*. The *well-meaning* and *undiſcerning Populacy* they now (as they did formerly, before things were ripe) engage to *the Covenant*, and tell them thoſe *horrid Conſequences* deduced from it, *belong* not to it; but afterwards engage men to them by vertue of *the Covenant*

Covenant they have taken, whose Obligation never fully *appears* til *due season*. Their first aim is at that part, which is least guarded, *Religion*: which being that wherein most are least concerned, is their first attempt. Because *the Church* would not *pull down* the *State*; the *State* must *pull down* the *Church*. But what followed? They who perswaded that *the Nobles*, & *Prelates*, were nor *good enough* to be their *Equals*; made it out, that *Coblers* and *Draymen* were *good enough* to be their *Masters*. And besides *the Grandees* who acted in that *change*, the whole *Party* were as forward to own *the other House*, as ready at any time to take *the other Oath*. I very well know, many will not, in spite of *Reason* and *Experience*, be perswaded, but that *reforming the Church* is the *sole aim* of *the Covenanters*. In the *new sense* of *reforming*, *the Church-Lands* being already in their opinion *disposed of*, *Reformation* must

begin at *the State:* and ſurely, it is great pity, but, they who will not *beware* by the *examples of others*, ſhould be made *examples to others.*

The ſecond Article of *the Covenant* is only talked of: and that being *the concernment* of *the Church*; others think themſelves not *intereſſed in.* But he who conſiders, that they are in the ſixth Article ſworn, never to be *wrought off*, no, not ſo much as to an *indifferency* or *neutrality*; but *zealouſly* and *conſtantly* in deſpight of all impediments, *purſue* all they have *ſworn:* And that in the fourth Article, they ſwear to *bring all to puniſhment*, who have been *Malignants* (Which words ſignifie what *they pleaſe,*) and expreſly all who have acted contrary to *the Covenant*; and they to be *puniſhed* as *the Supream Judicatories* (*i.e.* no doubt *the two Houſes*, who are no *Court* at all) or others from them ſhall *think fit:* will find *the Cavaliers* in

an

an ill caſe; nay, all who at any time did any thing which was ever Voted *Malignancy* by *the two Houſes*. The rigour of whoſe Sentence (they not being in a now capacity to *pardon* being *diſſolved*) muſt be now executed upon *the firſt opportunity*; nor muſt they at all queſtion *the reaſonableneſs* or *legality*, becauſe the Rule is, *As they*, or *any from them* (*i. e.* their Committees) *ſhall think convenient*. One thing I ſhall obſerve, that though the Parliament may be truſted to *act arbitrarily*, beſide or againſt *the Law*, (which they are not); yet that they may delegate ſuch an extravagant power, over *Lives* and *Fortunes*, as is here mentioned, to o-others (though men of ſuch *Principles*, and *Fortunes*, as our *Committees* were) who were to make *Offenders* by whom they might *thrive*, having nothing to *grow rich* with, but an *ill Conſcience* and other mens

faults, is such *a Liberty of the Subject* as destroyes all *the trust*. Besides, it is a rule in *Law* and *Reason*, Offices of *confidence* and *trust* (by our *Representatives* in Parliament) are not, cannot be delegated; because that *trust* is only *personal*.

I have before observed, That that *Invitation* in the conclusion to *forraign Churches*, (where there are no Parliaments with pretence of *share in the Power*,) must be to them confessedly as *Subjects*: whom notwithstanding they *absolve* from *their Allegiance*. Though it is not delivered in Scripture, that *freedom* from a *Master* or *Prince* who is *a Heathen*, is any part of that *liberty* wherein Christ hath *installed us*; and so is seditious. Having shewed it to be against *Duty*, I will in a word shew it to be against *our Interest*.

It engages us to pursue (by the way of *the Sword*, as their *Practice* and

and *the Invitation* in the concluſion ſhews) all we have ſworn to, all our dayes: which is, [*Whatever is contrary to the power of Godlineſs*]. So then, Every man is to *ſlay his brother*, who *commits* any *ſin* that deſerves it: ſo *many Covenanters*, ſo *many Commiſſioned Officers*. There is *a Tribunal* in every *breſt* to *condemn* and *execute both*. And if their *Oath* obligeth them to any *thing*, it doth to *this*; they being equally ſworn to all the other Articles, though that alone takes up all their thoughts. What *horrid effects* there would follow hence, themſelves would quickly *feel*: ſhould they thus begin to aſſert *the Covenant*, themſelves would quickly find its *edge*: They who ſet *a houſe* on *fire*, themſelves be ſoon made a part of that *fire*. It is not then more *diſhonourable* to *God*, *injurious* to *the King*, and the *Nation*: then it would, if *purſued*, be quick-

ly found to be to its moſt *violent aſſertors*. All that is deſired of them, is, they would either *purſue* the Covenant in *all things*, or *none*: that is, deal *equally* and *ſincerely*; ſhew that they act out of *the ſenſe* of an *Oath*, not of *a party*: or rather let *the Coveuant* be *buryed*, placed in *the Regions* of *Rottenneſs* and *Forgetfulneſs*; and let them be *quiet*, and ſuffer others to be *ſo*.

If any *Reproofs* ſeem in theſe Papers *too ſharp*; I wiſh *the unreaſonablneſs* of thoſe *expreßions* may thus appear, that *few deſerve them*. But then, as *few* are *concerned in them*, I ſhould willingly make a diſtinction between thoſe of *the Presbyterian Judgement*, and thoſe of *the Presbyterian Party*: (and I hope themſelves will concurre with me in it, by making it appear, that there are thoſe who may

may *approve* that *way* of *Government*, yet abhorr *the usual way* of *promoting* it.) The former may possibly be *reclaimed* by *rational discourses*; the latter by nothing but *severe Laws*.

FINIS.